The COMMUNIST

JUNE

PERSPECTIVES OF THE 1940 ELECTIONS
EARL BROWDER

THE LAND OF SOCIALISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAT
GEORGI DIMITROFF

RECOVERY DEMANDS A BOLD PROGRAM
GENE DENNIS

CURRENT TRENDS IN PSYCHOLOGY
R. L. GLEY

TWENTY CENTS

THE LENIN-STALIN TEACHING ON BUILDING SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY—M. MITIN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Acclaimed from Coast to Coast!

PAGES FROM A WORKER'S LIFE

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

"He is as American as Buffalo Bill. . . . There are enough adventures and battles to equip a dozen Anthony Adverses . . . here is a story to inspire all of us in the fight against fascism."

From *Change the World*, by Mike Gold

"Foster writes about the friends of his youth with passion and tenderness, so that these long-ago sailors, these hoboes now most certainly dead, these teamsters in the Western lumber-camps, come to life again in the pages of this moving book."

From a review by Ruth McKenny

"Bill's own story woven into the epic of labor is exciting and very dramatic. Arrests, deportation, soap boxing; escapes from death; life in prison; big union campaigns; the great steel strike. Here you see Foster, the labor leader, one of the best our country has produced."

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, in the *Sunday Worker*

"The slums are in it and the roar of the foundry; lonely years before the mast and dangerous years hoboing across America looking for work, organizing men into unions; imprisonment and illness—and through all of it you have the bright dream of America's tomorrow. In preparing himself for his arduous tasks as general of men, Foster's university was the brake rod and the machine shop, the windjammer and the strike committee."

Joseph North in the *New Masses*

320 Pages. Price $2.00

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVIII, No. 6 JUNE, 1939

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	483
Perspectives of the 1940 Presidential Election	EARL BROWDER	497
The Land of Socialism and the Struggle of the International Proletariat	GEORGI DIMITROFF	511
Recovery Demands a Bold Progressive Program	GENE DENNIS	523
Main Organizational Tasks of the Democratic Front	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	535
The Lenin-Stalin Teaching on the Building of Socialism in One Country	M. MITIN	542
Current Trends in American Psychology	R. L. GLEY	553
The Cultural Heritage of the Negro People	FRANCIS FRANKLIN	563
Book Reviews	PHILIP CARTER	572

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*
PRINTED IN U.S.A. 209

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READY SOON

FIGHTING FOR PEACE

By EARL BROWDER

254 pages, price $.50

The fight for a positive peace policy which would penalize the aggressor and aid the victim of aggression, and which would collaborate with all other peace forces to halt the fascist war incendiaries, is today the central issue confronting the American people. The whole national security of the United States evolves around this issue.

In **Fighting for Peace,** Earl Browder develops, in brilliant style, a rounded-out program on the question of peace. His analysis of the alignment of forces on a world scale, the motives and interests of the two camps, the position of the United States in relation to the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis, to the other so-called democratic powers, to the Soviet Union, and the national policy which he outlines for this country, provides an invaluable instrument for the further rallying of America's peace forces.

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Secretary Hopkins and the Chamber of Commerce. Who Is Strangling Private Enterprise? Lenin on Monopoly and Free Competition. Browder Reports to the Communist National Committee—an Anti-Monopoly Program for Recovery. Housing and Nationalization of Banks and Railroads. Augment Mass Purchasing Power and Curb Big Business. National Economic Committee Begins a Hearing. Farley's Trip and 1940. Democratic Party Can Win Only as Progressive-New Deal Coalition. Browder's Analysis of Political Perspectives. Candidates and Third Term Issue. Reactionary Speculations Versus Political Realities. Labor Unity and Work Among Farmers. Wall Street Exposes Its Hand in Coal. Next Steps in Fight for Trade Union Unity. Isolating Reaction on Farms. Spanish Refugees, World Peace and Latin America. Unsolved Problems of Party Building.

TAKING full advantage of the economic decline and of the lack of unity in the camp of its opponents, Big Business reaction is intensifying its offensive against the masses on all fronts. It is necessary to take cognizance of the fact that this offensive is becoming more concentrated and more reckless, as exemplified by the deluge of so-called anti-alien bills in Congress. And from this, a number of conclusions have to be drawn.

Harry L. Hopkins, Secretary of Commerce, speaking of the resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at its meeting early in May, felt compelled to say that "the tone of some of these resolutions—on wages and hours, for instance—indicate a fundamental disagreement with Administration policies on many points." This puts it very mildly. As a matter of plain fact, the Chamber resolutions call for the repeal or emasculation of every progressive measure on the statute books. These resolutions constitute an open declaration of war against the Administration.

It is true, of course, that the Chamber leadership, which does not speak the mind of business as a whole, is in "fundamental disagreement" with President Roosevelt's Administration, but not only on the wages and hours law. Its resolutions call for intensified war against the Labor Relations Act, against relief to the unemployed, against the Social Security Act, against bank and exchange regulations, against the farm, taxation and foreign policies of the Administration. It is fundamental disagreement, to be sure, but one which is translated into action, into a concentrated economic and political offensive against the people, an offensive designed to wreck the Administration and to bring to power a government fully subservient to the reactionary and pro-fascist monopolies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One conclusion to be drawn from this condition is that the central issue between the people and Big Business reaction has to be made clearer and plainer. And having done this, *the issue has to be joined.* For it cannot be denied that the progressive camp as a whole has not yet fully clarified itself on this central issue, nor has it yet come to grips with it in concerted struggle against the reactionary offensive.

Big Business demands "freedom" for private enterprise. It blames the government, labor, the people's democracy for lack of business confidence, for the economic crisis and for the difficulties of recovery. And what does the progressive camp answer to this? The spokesmen of the Administration, for example, usually reply that these assertions are untrue, that government policies have helped business instead of hurting it. Which is true, of course. But it is not the whole truth, not even its most essential part. For it leaves plenty of room for reaction to claim that without government interference and intervention, things would have been better. And since things today are far from being good, many vacillating sections of the population, vacillating between reaction and progress, tend to give a sympathetic hearing to the claims of the reactionaries. Can this be ignored? No, it cannot.

It would seem that the time is here for the progressive camp to join issue *squarely* with Big Business reaction on the question of private enterprise. Where does the responsibility really lie for the present "sluggishness" of private business enterprise? Who is it that is really hampering and paralyzing it? The answer is not difficult to find. It is *monopoly domination,* monopoly domination in the economy and in politics, monopoly domination in the period of the general crisis of the capitalist system. It is the *offensive* of the monopolies in the conditions of a continuing cyclical economic crisis taking place in the midst of the second imperialist war. *It is this monopoly domination that is strangling and paralyzing private business enterprise.*

For decades wide masses of our people have been learning from their own experience that wherever monopoly made its appearance, there private business initiative and enterprise were being suppressed and strangled. The farmers knew it. The small and independent businessmen knew it too. And from a somewhat different angle, the workers knew it as armed citadels of open shop exploitation and reaction. The people as a whole have come to know monopoly as the worst economic oppressor and main source of all political reaction and imperialism. With the result that the entire content of the political struggle in the last forty years was basically a struggle against monopoly domination. Is it not something to be wondered at that, at this time, when monopoly rule has become most oppressive to the masses and has come into the most irreconcilable contradiction with private competitive enterprise, that at this time particularly the progressive anti-monopoly camp should fail to bring this issue to the forefront as the *major* issue against Big Business reaction?

The entire history of this century, and particularly the experiences of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last decade, leave no doubt in the absolute correctness of Lenin's analysis of the nature of monopoly capitalism. He said that monopoly does not do away with free competition, or what is known more popularly as private business enterprise. Monopoly, he said, continues to exist side by side with private enterprise *but in irreconcilable contradiction with it.* This means as a conflicting force, hampering, hamstringing and destroying competing private enterprises. And in times of economic crisis, as shown convincingly by Stalin, monopoly domination is the strongest single force militating against the normal overcoming of such cyclical crises. It was so with the crisis in 1929; it is so today, only a little worse because the present crisis takes place in an imperialist war, at the basis of which is to be found again the domination of the monopolies in the capitalist countries.

Many a progressive tends to be taken aback by such inquiries from spokesmen of Big Business reaction as this: but why didn't government pump priming succeed in promoting capital expansion and heavy industry whose course is decisive for business recovery? Thus the *Wall Street Journal,* attacking Hopkins' criticism of the Chamber of Commerce, argues like this: Yes, government expenditures did succeed in augmenting somewhat the purchasing power of the people and thus may have contributed to the five per cent expansion in retail trade in the first quarter of this year. But . . . "But where is the underlying capital expansion which will make such expenditures unnecessary?" (May 10.)

Yes, where is it? Wall Street admits that the government has been stimulating retail trade and, hence, private enterprise in the consumption industries. This should normally have a favorable effect upon the heavy industries. Why then did these industries respond so poorly or not at all? Perhaps we should speak more specifically on this question. When one speaks of heavy industries, one has in mind such branches of economy as steel, electric power, the railroads. And who is it that governs the production policies, price and wage policies, and investment policies of steel, electric power and railroads? It is not the government; that everybody knows. Nor is it labor, the farmers or the middle classes of the cities.

The people who determine these policies and hence the business course of these industries are the finance capitalists of America, those who hold in their hands the combined power of industry and finance. And who are these people? There is no secret about it. Twice in the last twenty-six years, Congressional Committees have investigated the matter. One was the Pujo investigation in 1913, the other was the Pecora investigation in 1932. And although none of them had probed deeply enough, both had brought out the fact that the masters of these industries were and are the House of Morgan, the House of Rockefeller, the House of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. These three aggregations of finance capital have been shown to be, by government investigation, not just banks and old-time money-lenders, but nerve centers and controlling powers of monopoly, of heavy industry and, through it, of the nation's economy. These are the *economic royalists*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of whom the President spoke so truly and eloquently, it would appear now, so very long ago.

Responding to the demands of the majority of the people for relief from the intolerable burdens of the crises, President Roosevelt's Administration has tried (not always with sufficient consistency and persistence) to meet the immediate needs of the masses. By augmenting the purchasing power of the masses, the government sought in the course of the last six years to stimulate private business enterprise. This no one can deny successfully. But, say the reactionaries, you have not moved the heavy industries, you have not maintained farm prices, you have made no serious dent in unemployment; therefore, your spending policies are all wrong. Is that correct? Of course not. Without these spending policies, things for the masses would have been much worse, incomparably worse. And the national economy as a whole would have been in a much worse fix.

Therefore, the conclusion to be made is not less spending for unemployed and farm relief, as Big Business reaction is doing, speaking through the leaders of the Chamber of Commerce, the Republican Party and the anti-Roosevelt Democrats. No. This conclusion would mean not only a return to the dark days of Hoover but a coming closer to the barbarities of fascism, for which Hooverism is preparing the ground. No. The conclusion to be made is that old-time spending by itself will not and cannot do the job.

The job, roughly speaking, is twofold. It is to bring *adequate* relief to the victims of the economic crisis and of unemployment. It is, secondly, to stimulate private business enterprise. This twofold job must, therefore, be tackled from two ends—by steadily raising the purchasing power of the masses and by curbing the powers of the monopolies. And it is the latter end that we are especially concerned with here. To curb the powers of the monopolies is the only effective and direct way to *release* the initiative of private enterprise. And this way must be chosen, chosen *now*.

At the plenary session of the National Committee of the Communist Party, held in New York City, May 6, 7, 8, Comrade Browder showed in his report that this is precisely the job. He demonstrated in graphic detail, on the single demand for a true national housing program, that the carrying out of such a program by the government, along the lines of curbing the vested interests of the monopolies in this field, would not only greatly improve the housing conditions of the sub-standard one-third of our population, but would also stimulate most powerfully business generally and private business enterprise in all fields.

The report also indicated that it could be shown similarly that the nationalization of the banks and the railroads would have the same general effect.

In other words, the combined effect of a genuine national housing program and the nationalization of the banks and railroads, demands supported by the majority of the people, would be a radical improvement in the home market and a substantial though partial release of private enterprise from the stranglehold of mo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nopoly domination. It would not be socialism, of course, nor the beginnings of it. It would be meeting the offensive of Big Business reaction in the present crisis conditions in the only effective progressive and democratic way, seeking to overcome the crisis in the interests of the people within the limitations of capitalism.

Nationalization of the banks would mean the establishment of government ownership and control of those big aggregations of finance capital—Morgan, Rockefeller, Kuhn-Loeb—which are not banks in the strict sense of the word but centers of monopoly control. Government ownership and democratic control of these three monopoly centers should give the people the opportunity *to influence the production, price and investment policies* of such decisive branches of economy as steel, transport, public utilities, at the least. More directly, control of these banking institutions would enable the government to bring to life the idle capital now lying in the banks, moving it into productive enterprise; on a capitalist profit basis, to be sure, but into *productive* enterprise, something the money-monopolists are unwilling and unable to do.

The government would not have to borrow a cent to finance productive public works, or to refinance at nominal interest mortgages on farms and small homes. It would merely do, on a capitalist basis, what the monopolists could not and would not, namely, put idle capital in the banks to "work" for profit. Utilizing the existing bank deposits and tremendous gold reserves, as the money-monopolists have been doing but are not doing now, the government in control of just the three mentioned financial aggregations would be in a position to begin to tackle seriously the rehabilitation of the "lower" one-third of our farming population and the securing of credits to small business. All this would be done on a capitalist basis of profit to the investors and without increasing the public debt.

As to the nationalization of the railroads, it has been shown repeatedly that this is the only way now to "cure" this basic branch of economy in the interests of the people and all other industries. Only the government could undertake the big job of rehabilitating the railroad industry which, in consequence, would stimulate to an extraordinary degree all the basic industries of the country. What such rehabilitation would mean for recovery has been shown graphically by Representative Lee E. Geyer of California in a speech to the House on May 1. It is true that he urged a large scale rehabilitation program of the railroads "pending the time when the railroads are taken over by the Federal Government." But it is obvious that only under nationalization would such a program become *fully effective.*

In this connection, two things have to be kept in mind. One is that this recovery program, calling for a broad national housing project and the nationalization of the banks, railroads and munitions industries, is not suggested as a means of doing away with cyclical crises, or with anarchy of production, or with capitalist exploitation. These can and will be done away with only by the abolition of capitalism and the socialist reorganization of society. The experiences in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Soviet Union are conclusive on this point. But this does not in the least detract from the importance of these proposals. As already indicated by the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party (June, 1938), such a recovery program is the only practical and effective one for the people to combat the offensive of finance capital in the present crisis which is taking place in the midst of the second imperialist war. It is an indispensable program for a successful struggle against the coming of fascism, for the curbing of the pro-fascist monopolies and eventually for the socialist liberation. *It is a program for victory over reaction in 1940.* And this is the way in which Comrade Browder presented the matter to the May meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party.

The second thing to keep in mind is that these recovery proposals are not of the same nature as the public ownership schemes of reformist socialism. It is not a program of wholesale nationalization. It is not proposed here to bring socialism by reforming capitalism out of existence. This cannot be done. The way to socialism is the way of the proletarian dictatorship, and the road to that lies through the people's struggle against fascism and pro-fascist reaction in which the working class will play an ever increasing part of influence and leadership. To repeat, these proposals constitute a program of struggle for recovery within the limitations of capitalism, for blocking the road to fascism in this country, for insuring the victory of the democratic forces of the people in 1940.

From this standpoint, it is absolutely essential to make this people's recovery and anti-monopoly program the major issue and central point of political activity and struggle. And the hearings now held by the Temporary National Economic Committee on the academic- sounding but all-important subject of the "Formation and Flow of Capital" could and should be made an effective instrument for promoting these struggles.

* * *

THE western trip of the Democratic National Chairman, James A. Farley, has naturally given rise again to considerable speculation, guessing, as well as to some serious discussion on the struggle between the progressive and reactionary wings of the Democratic Party, on its probable presidential candidate, on its chances for victory in 1940. It is also evident that wide masses of the people are already concerning themselves with these questions.

Whether James Farley wants to be a candidate himself or not is important of course. But more important at the outset of such discussions is the question posed by President Roosevelt in a practical manner last January. In what direction is the Democratic Party proposing to go? Does it propose to go in the direction of liberalism and progress, or does it want to compete with the Republicans in conservatism and reaction? He expressed his own view, as will be recalled, very definitely. He summed it up by saying that the Democratic Party will win in 1940 only as a party of liberalism and progress, and will surely be defeated if it turns to conservatism and reaction. Which is absolutely cor-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rect. As was shown by Comrade Browder, in his report to the Communist National Committee,* every presidential victory of the Democratic Party since the Civil War was won on a program of liberalism as against Republican Party reaction.

But Comrade Browder has shown more than that. He proved that the Democratic Party can win in 1940 only on one condition, on condition that it undertakes to express, in its platform and candidate, the desires and attitudes of all the progressive and democratic forces in the country. In other words, if it fights in fact *as a coalition* of all progressive forces of whatever party, or non-party, able thus to secure the support of the workers, farmers and middle classes and of their independent mass organizations. If it does not, if it falls into the hands of the Garners and Glasses, the democratic and progressive forces will be moved inevitably to put forth their own ticket, to realize the coalition *in a new way*, with the result that the Democratic Party will be reduced to a third rate minority position.

It will be recalled that already at the December (1938) meeting of the Communist National Committee, Comrade Browder projected the idea in this way. He said that the presidential candidate to symbolize the people's victory in 1940 will have to be one who meets the approval of such spokesmen of the progressive forces as Roosevelt, LaGuardia, Lewis and the progressives in the A. F. of L. This is the coalition idea in terms of representative spokesmen of the population. It is an idea which is now shared by wide circles of the population. It is the development of the policy of the *democratic front* against reaction and fascism, formulated by the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party in June, 1938.

As the campaign for 1940 is entering its first active stages, it becomes imperative to clarify the following point. Namely, that the only guarantee that the Democratic Party will really express the desires of the progressive coalition, *i.e.*, of the majority of the people, is for the New Deal and President Roosevelt to secure control of the Democratic nominating convention, on the one hand and, on the other, for the independent mass organizations of the workers, farmers and middle classes *to act unitedly and with great influence in the progressive-New Deal coalition.* It is also clear that these independent mass organizations, acting in concert during the pre-convention months, can and must exercise a determining influence on the outcome of the nominating convention itself.

The latter point is at present of major importance. For it must be realized that the struggle in the Democratic Party on the question of presidential candidates, a struggle already in full swing, is not just an old time inner party fight. It is this and much more than this. It is in truth a vital and crucial phase, at this time, of the general fight of progress against reaction. And so it is correctly viewed by the reactionary monopolies themselves. These monopolies, which stand behind the anti-New Deal Democrats as well as behind the ruling circles of the Republican Party, are deliberately seeking to reduce the Democratic

* Earl Browder, *The 1940 Elections*, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party in 1940 to a minority position. Why? For two reasons: one is to insure the victory of the Republican Party which is considered by the monopolies the most dependable instrument for the promotion of pro-fascist reaction; the second reason is the determination of the monopolies to rebuild the crumbling traditional "two-party system" of finance capital, the system of only two major parties both controlled by the monopolies.

To try to achieve both of these aims, Big Business reaction correctly sees at the present time only one way. It is the way of placing the Garners and Glasses in control of the Democratic Party and its next national nominating convention. Should this actually come to pass, the further outlook as seen by the reactionary monopolies today would be something like this: the independent progressive mass movements of the workers, farmers and middle classes would naturally break with the Democratic Party, the latter thus becoming definitely a minority party. In such a situation, the reactionary monopolies figure that the Republican Party would have the best chances of success in 1940, hoping that the independent progressive mass movement and the defeated New Dealers in the Democratic Party will have neither the time nor the necessary preparation for united organized action to become a serious challenger for power in the next national elections.

We shall see in a moment that these reactionary calculations are in some vital respects based on hopes more than on reality. But before doing so, we must make sure that we understand well the reactionary tactics, a point stressed very much by Comrade Browder in his report. It is to split the Democratic Party and to reduce it to a minority position by defeating the New Deal leadership and placing the anti-New Dealers in control. Incidentally, whatever the personal feeling may be of the reactionary Democrats, the very logic of their position leads them to the defeat of their party. They are, therefore, champions of defeat—*defeatists.*

Now as to the hopes and realities of the reactionary calculations. Judging by the writings of some of the spokesmen of the reactionary monopolies, it would appear as though President Roosevelt was already defeated in the Democratic Party, that the Garners and Glasses are already in full control, and that the only thing left is for the next nominating convention to ratify this condition.

Is this a true picture of the realities in the Democratic Party? Not at all. The true condition is still very much in flux, and very much can still happen between now and next summer to place President Roosevelt and the New Deal in firm control of the Democratic nominating convention. That the overwhelming majority of the masses supporting the Democratic Party are for Roosevelt's leadership and for the New Deal, nobody can deny successfully.

Nor can it be denied that the Democratic Party *organizations* and the people now in control of it, that is, the forces which determine the make-up of conventions, are generally speaking, very much susceptible (though in varying degrees) to the pressure of the rank and file, *when this pressure is organized, articulate,*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscious and therefore powerful. Especially as it become obvious that the choice between listening to this pressure and ignoring it may spell the difference between victory and defeat for the Democratic Party in 1940.

It can therefore be confidently said that, while the Garner-Glass outfit has today the advantage of apparent dominance in Congress *because of its coalition with the Republicans,* and while this same outfit (always backed by the reactionary monopolies against Roosevelt but never against the Republicans) seems to have the jump on the New Dealers in the rounding up of convention delegates, the possibilities for New Deal control of that convention are exceptionally good and will continue to improve as we go along. *Provided:* the independent mass movements and organizations of the workers, farmers and middle classes unite their efforts for increased political activity and struggle generally as well as for influencing the composition and outcome of the next Democratic national convention; and provided *further* that the New Deal forces in the Democratic Party unfold in the coming months a real struggle for the New Deal, inside and outside their party, on a program of recovery and struggle against reaction as discussed in the foregoing, linking their efforts intimately with those of the independent progressive organizations of the masses. On these two main provisions hinges the New Deal victory in the Democratic national convention, and the satisfaction of these provisions would insure such a victory.

Assuming that such a fight will be carried on in the coming months, bringing the masses *themselves* into motion, activity and political struggle, encouraging the progressive anti-fascist struggle in the world and being in turn reinforced by them, something else will be achieved too. If despite all efforts, the reactionaries should nevertheless succeed in their plan to defeat the New Deal in the Democratic Party, then the democratic majority of the people will have at its disposal a practical coalition of all progressive forces, sufficiently united and conscious, to take the field in 1940 through an independent ticket *and to win the struggle.*

And here is precisely where the reactionary speculators are making a mistake. They keep on saying that "third party" movements have gone out of fashion because of their proven practical futility. They say further that, this being the case, the New Dealers and their independent allies will have no place to go should the Democratic Party fall into reactionary control. They conclude therefore that the progressive forces will then have to support either of the two major parties (both in control of finance capital) or remain passive altogether. A very alluring perspective for the pro-fascist monopolies! But the answer to all this speculation is this: futile "third party" movements, that is, minority groups of this nature, have really gone out of fashion, for the reason that the class forces which in the past were feeding such movements are today joined and swimming in the waters of *majority movements;* they are the *majority of the people,* they are the growing democratic front. It is these forces that elected Roosevelt in 1932 and, on a higher plane, re-elected him in 1936.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And in 1940, these same forces will constitute a much broader and more consolidated *coalition* of the majority of the people. Consequently, if this coalition succeeds in making the Democratic Party serve the great progressive aims of the people, well and good; that party will certainly win and the democratic masses will move forward, leaving the Republican Party a smaller minority than in 1936. On the other hand, if reaction succeeds in making the Democratic Party its tool, this coalition *remains a majority coalition* and surely more consolidated. It takes the field with an independent ticket *and wins,* leaving both the Republican and Democratic Parties as minority parties in control of the reactionary monopolies.

No, the democratic majority will not have to look for a place to go. If it carries on a good fight from now until the elections on all front, economic and political, against the offensive of Big Business reaction, building the progressive-New Deal coalition and combatting the reactionaries in the Democratic Party, the place for the majority *will have been made.* It will be the place of victory, regardless of the precise political instrument used for the purpose.

In this connection, the question of candidates naturally arises. And although the Communist Party cannot and will not be committed to any presidential candidate but its own, it does not remain indifferent to a question of such major political importance. As analyzed by Comrade Browder, a situation may arise where, in the judgment of the progressive coalition, the best candidate able to unite the broadest circles in the victorious majority would be President Roosevelt himself. Given the relation of forces as it is today, such a situation is almost certain to arise and with it a demand that the President run for a third term. Anticipating such a possibility, reaction has been active for some time building up anti-third term sentiment. Hence, Comrade Browder raised this question: shall the majority of the people let themselves be cheated out of victory in 1940, if President Roosevelt's candidacy becomes indispensable, just because it would violate a tradition even though of progressive origin? Merely to put the question is to answer it. There is too much at stake for the progress of America and the well being of the masses to let reaction successfully exploit a tradition and to turn it against the very democracy which gave rise to this tradition. It is encouraging to note that the masses of the people are increasingly beginning to feel the same way about it.

And so the message of the May meeting of the Communist National committee is: cement and build the progressive-New Deal coalition from the bottom up, raise the political self-activity of the masses, lead their struggles against the offensive of Big Business reaction in all fields, prepare for the democratic victory of the people's coalition in 1940.

* * *

Two special problems have received particular attention in the report of Comrade Browder and in the committee deliberations—labor unity and work among the farmers.

Labor unity today means first of all trade union unity, particularly unity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. There is no doubt that the struggle for trade union unity has been making headway. This is perhaps best demonstrated by the fine solidarity of large sections of the A. F. of L. with the C.I.O. in the common fight against the destruction of the Labor Relations Act despite the desperate maneuvers of Green-Woll-Hutcheson. It is further demonstrated by the fact that united political action between the unions of the two organizations in various localities is not diminishing but, on the contrary, continues to expand even though very slowly. Above all, the need for unity is felt so acutely and is by now so universally recognized that not even the worst enemies of unity among the reactionaries in the A. F. of L. dare *openly* advocate an anti-unity position.

Furthermore, labor unity is coming to be recognized by wide sections of the people, not only the workers but also their progressive allies, as a most vital need for a successful fight against the general offensive of reaction and fascist aggression and for victory in 1940. As Browder put it, unity of labor is becoming a national interest of the American people.

Reaction is daily plotting against labor unity by all means at its command. It did its utmost to provoke a sharp conflict in the coal industry. But the magnificent spirit of the miners and the splendid leadership, coupled with the sympathies of the A. F. of L. membership for the United Mine Workers even though this sympathy was insufficiently demonstrated, and the alertness of labor's progressive allies, all combined to expose the reactionary conspiracy and to defeat it. The nature of this conspiracy is partly revealed in the observations of the financial editor of the *World-Telegram*, Mr. Ralph Hendershot, in these words:

> "Wall Street has been interested in the fight from the political as well as economic angle. It saw President Roosevelt being placed in a rather awkward position. If he seemed to favor the C.I.O. he would further alienate the members of the A. F. of L., who might be inclined to work against him and his party in the next elections. If he appeared to favor the operators the solid support of the C.I.O. probably would not be available to him in 1940.
>
> "Needless to say, leaders of the financial district were shedding no tears over President Roosevelt's position. Moreover, their interest in the strike was more than a mere academic one. They had hoped that both Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt would receive a setback." (May 12.)

Well, they did *not* receive a setback but the reactionary conspirators did. And this is highly encouraging for the further struggle for unity. Yet it must be realized that this unity is not here yet and that the situation is full of dangers. Wall Street is on the job looking for new opportunities to administer "setbacks" to labor and its allies in preparation for 1940.

The May meeting of the Communist National Committee emphasized two major points in the promotion of the fight for unity. One is that the main, if not the only, obstacle to unity at the present time are the reactionaries in the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. who are following a line of attaching the A. F. of L. to the reactionary Republicans and of splitting the A. F. of L. itself. The task therefore is to intensify manifold the fight against the reactionary splitters in the A. F. of L., to isolate them from their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

membership and organizations, in the name of the immediate well-being of the workers in the industries and most particularly for the achievement of a progressive-New Deal victory in 1940.

The second point is that the main avenue to labor unity remains the continued development of common day-by-day actions of the unions of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on immediate economic and political issues of which the struggle to save the Labor Relations Act is the most outstanding. Here the fraternal initiative of the C.I.O. unions, already displayed successfully in many cases, will prove of inestimable value. More of this initiative and collaboration is the urgent demand of the moment.

In discussing work among the farmers, several things have to be noted especially. Since the elections in 1938, it has been evident that certain sections of the farmers have been wavering away from New Deal support. Such waverings were noticeable largely among the farm capitalists, pulling along also numbers of middle farmers in various parts of the country.

A conclusive analysis of the present situation would have to probe conditions *in specific agricultural regions* and for specific crops, since each of these has its own special characteristics.

Yet it is possible to make one general though tentative observation. It is this: while the waverings and vacillations of the middle farmers have, on the whole, become *arrested*, there is as yet little evidence of a movement back to New Deal support but rather a condition of pause and expectation. Furthermore, among the farm capitalists and sections of well-to-do farmers, it is possible to observe a *hardening* of opposition to the New Deal, to which reactionary manipulators are seeking to give an anti-labor twist. As to the mass of small farmers and large sections of middle farmers, the evidence would seem to indicate continued distrust and opposition to reaction, general sympathy for President Roosevelt and the New Deal, coupled with hope and determined expectation that more effective measures will be adopted by the Administration to meet their needs.

What are the danger spots in such a situation? The danger is, considering the continued agricultural crisis, that the indecisive sections of the middle farmers will fall under the influence of the anti-progressive and anti-labor leadership of the farmer-capitalists, confusing and demoralizing also numbers of small farmers. Such a danger is real and immediate. And the answer is to isolate these reactionary farm-capitalist influences on the countryside. This means helping the middle and small farmer to come forward *more independently*, to assert more energetically their special demands *as distinct from and opposed to* the demands and policies of the reactionary farmer-capitalists. This means further that closer and more intimate day-by-day collaboration *in the localities* must be established between the unions (agricultural labor) and the small and middle farmers.

Communists can, of course, be very helpful in winning the decisive mass of the farmers to the camp of progress and democracy. And this is the time to do it. Comrade Browder made the point that every Party organization should be able at once to make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a serious beginning, even though modest. He added that henceforth the political maturity of a Party organization would become evident precisely by its ability to make an earnest beginning in farm work.

It is clear that one cannot speak seriously of victory in 1940 without putting major efforts into improving the situation, economic and political, on the countryside.

* * *

BUILDING the Communist Party, numerically and ideologically, was a central item in the reports and deliberations of the National Committee. Comrade Browder indicated the specific nature of the problem today, and the main lines of solution, by pointing to the following: We have a lag in the *rate* of growth of our membership resulting from an accumulation of *unsolved* problems which themselves arise from the Party's growth. Problems of organization. Problems of agitation and propaganda. Problems of building and promoting leading personnel (cadres). Problems of press circulation. The essence of all of them is to complete the necessary readjustments in methods of organization and work, corresponding to the greater demands placed upon our Party by the mass movements, to the increased influence of the Party and its new relationships to the progressive mass movements, to the greater opportunities. We need a readjustment which would facilitate work on a larger scale and of a higher quality.

With this as a line of orientation, Comrade Stachel's detailed report on Party building presented not only a true dynamic picture of the Party's life and growth but also projected a number of practical measures to speed up the solution of the unsolved problems.

A point much stressed in this connection was the development of a strong *Party consciousness* in every member, a fuller understanding of the Party's line and policies, a systematic participation of the entire membership in the checking up of the Party's line in actual practice and in the formulation of its day-to-day policies. This, in the judgment of the National Committee, would assist greatly in combatting all hostile influences, in orienting every Party member correctly in his daily activities, making more effective our struggle against the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite agents of fascism.

The work of the May meeting of the National Committee was carried on under the inspiration of the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the historic report of Comrade Stalin.* The experiences of this great and model Party became a living part of the work of our own National Committee fructifying and enriching its deliberations and decisions. And this reminds us once more of the need of studying and learning from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* of which nearly 70,000 copies have already been sold by the Party organizations; studying the *History* to really *learn* it and to learn its *lessons* for the advancement of the American working class into positions of lead-

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ership in the democratic camp of the country.

The participation of authoritative delegations from our brother Parties in Latin America (Chile, Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico) and Canada imparted to the work of the National Committee special significance and importance. It added weight and effectiveness to the Committee's decisions, for example, on such vital matters as the struggle for a *consistent* application of the Good Neighbor policy, for economic assistance and collaboration, for an immediate radical improvement of the economic and political conditions in Puerto Rico, for more effective combined resistance to fascist aggression.

In the formulation of practical steps for aid to the Spanish refugees and for the promotion of the struggle for a positive peace policy by the United States, as well as in the discussions on the struggle for world labor unity, the participation of the delegates from Latin America and Canada was of the utmost value. This participation will prove an important contribution to the building of the alliance between the people of the United States and the peoples of Latin America and Canada against fascism and imperialism and for democracy, peace and national independence.

The May meeting of the Communist National Committee has made a distinct and special contribution to the building of the democratic front and to the preparation for victory in 1940. It stressed the need of rousing the masses themselves to political self-activity and struggle on all fields, urging the projection into central place of an anti-monopoly program for combatting the crisis. The discussions were highly instructive, particularly the contributions of such Party leaders as Foster, Ford and Mother Bloor. The Party has now before it the results of the May meeting of the National Committee, especially Comrade Browder's report, and can confidently proceed to tackling its important immediate tasks.

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSPECTIVES OF THE 1940 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

BY EARL BROWDER

A PROGRESSIVE AND DEMOCRATIC COALITION—THE WAY TO VICTORY

SINCE the Communist Party will apparently not be in a position to elect its own candidate to the Presidency in 1940, the alignment of forces in our country's political life which will determine our course as a nation for the next period must be studied in the broad fields outside the Communists' immediate influence, mainly in the Democratic and Republican Parties. We cannot be indifferent in this problem merely because our own Party is not an immediate challenger for power. It is of high importance for us fully to understand the relations of forces in the coming Presidential struggle, to understand better than others in fact, for thereby we will find the possibility to assist the forces of progress and democracy, to the limit of our ability, to prevent the reactionary, pro-fascist, and warmongering interests from regaining complete national governmental power.

We have long noted the fact that, for the main body of the voting population, Republican and Democratic Party labels do not identify any consistent and homogeneous body of interests, ideas or political policies. These party labels are nominal, and cover up widely disparate and conflicting interests, ideas and policies. This is especially true of the Democratic Party, the party of the Administration, which is sharply divided into two wings, the reactionaries and the New Dealers, engaged in a bitter struggle in Congress over legislation, and in the country for the control of the 1940 party convention which will nominate the candidate for the Presidency. Let us examine the Democratic Party more closely.

Since the Civil War, the Democratic Party has named only three successful candidates to the Presidency, each for two terms; they were Cleveland, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The first two were elected, for each of their terms, by a *minority* of the popular vote. Roosevelt was the first Democrat, since the Civil War, to come to the Presidency with a majority of the voters behind him, the first candidate to make the Democratic Party a *majority party* in the country. Cleveland's first election in 1884 was with a vote only 62,683 higher than Blaine, but over 70,000 less than a majority, out of a total of more than nine and a half million votes. In

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1888, Cleveland received almost a hundred thousand votes more than Harrison, but lost, due to the uneven geographical distribution of the vote; but this time he received almost 400,000 less than a majority of the total vote. In 1892, Cleveland was again elected, but again lacking almost a half million votes of a clear majority. In 1912, Wilson was elected by a minority that lacked over 1,200,000 of being half the votes cast; while in 1916, he still lacked 135,000 of a clear majority.

The next important item to note is that the Democratic Party, always a minority since the Civil War until F. D. Roosevelt, made an especially weak showing when its candidate was a conservative; it dropped to 35 per cent of the vote in 1920, with Cox, and to 29 per cent in 1924, with the Wall Street lawyer, Davis; while in 1928, with Al Smith who was supposed to be a progressive in those days, it recovered only to a little over 40 per cent of the total. Between Cleveland and Wilson, Bryan was the candidate in three of the four elections, and twice came close to victory, always as a "radical," but in 1904, Parker, conservative, dropped far behind Bryan's strength. These figures show that the Democratic Party, always a minority, found its only chance of victory in espousing the popular or "radical" cause; the only exception was in Cleveland's second election, when exceptional confusion in politics brought the popular vote to a candidate who had turned conservative after his first election.

The evidence is overwhelming that even before the crisis of 1929-33 unsettled all political alignments, the Democratic Party had the following of not more than one-third of the voting electorate, and that its rise above that proportion was *dependent upon forming a coalition with progressive revolters from the Republican camp, and with popular third-party movements.*

Turn now to the Republican Party. In 1912, Theodore Roosevelt's "Bull Moose Party" split-off showed that a distinct majority of the Republican voters were susceptible to the popular or progressive appeal, and when his vote is added to that of the Socialist Party of that year, it was over one-third of the total, as against the progressive Democrat, Wilson, while the reactionary Taft gathered less than one-fourth of the total. In 1924, the progressive Republican, LaFollette, gathered almost one-third as many votes as the regular Republican ticket for his independent candidacy *without a party organization.* In 1932 more than one-third of those previously voting Republican swung over to Roosevelt, while in 1936 the proportion was even increased.

The evidence is convincing that even before the 1929-33 crisis, but most certainly after the crisis, the Republican Party could depend with certainty upon the support of no more than one-third of the voting electorate, and that its rise above that proportion *depended upon the popular appeal of its electoral campaign and candidates.*

We can draw the conclusion from these facts that for a long time there have been taking shape, and since the 1929-33 crisis have become definite, three main voting groups, each representing at present almost evenly one-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

third of the voting electorate, one continuing to follow the Democratic Party whatever its political complexion of the moment, the other similarly continuing to follow the Republican Party, but the third turning to one or the other, or expressing itself in third-party movements, as it finds necessary to give expression most effectively to its popular, progressive, democratic and "radical" demands, moods and aspirations.

President Roosevelt and the New Deal represent that middle-of-the road path which has brought about a coalition betwen the Democratic Party and the third group of equal strength, a coalition that gathered the Administration's great popular majority in the country. This coalition represents the only possible basis for a Democratic Party victory in 1940.

But the Democratic Party, since 1937, has been sharply divided on the legislative program which is the foundation upon which this coalition has been built, and without which it cannot continue. The Garner-Glass-Wheeler wing of the Democratic Party set out to sabotage and defeat that program, and willingly paid the price of heavy losses in the 1938 elections to achieve their aim. They are now driving for control of the Democratic Convention in 1940 apparently prepared to face the inevitable defeat of their party in the Presidential election if thereby they can restore reactionary control and leadership over their party.

The Garner-Glass-Wheeler wing of the party holds the preponderance of organizational positions and power; the Roosevelt or New Deal wing holds considerable organizational position, but its main strength consists in its popular following and in representing the coalition with the third group of the electorate, which is the key to electoral victory, to office and power. The Democratic Party can almost certainly elect its nominee in 1940, if it names a candidate and writes a platform fully representing the New Deal coalition; it will with equal certainty go down to defeat if its candidate and platform conform to the wishes of the Garner-Glass wing of the party.

Much depends, therefore, upon the outcome of the Democratic Convention in 1940. The radical one-third of the electorate has no chance, nor any hope, of being represented by the Republican candidate and platform, which seem inevitably in the control of the Hoover-Dewey-Taft dominant leadership. It must therefore look for a victory of the Roosevelt New Deal wing in the Democratic Convention —or, failing that, face the alternative of break-up, dispersal, and defeat without a fight, or the launching of a new party of its own. Between a Garner - Glass - Wheeler Democratic Party and a Hoover-Dewey-Taft Republican Party it has no choice.

The radical one-third of the voters find it necessary, therefore, to wish for and work for victory for the Roosevelt wing in the Democratic Convention. But, having as yet no guarantee of such a victory, it must prepare for alternative action in case of defeat at the hands of the Garner-Glass forces.

Conditions for New Deal victory in the Democratic Convention are not identical with the conditions for victory in the November balloting. Stating the problem in terms of the geographical distribution of forces, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difference can be put in this form: For victory in the Democratic Convention, the New Deal must depend mainly upon the North and West while fighting to gain as much support as possible from the South; for victory in the November election, the New Deal can fully depend upon the South (once it wins the Convention) and the West (under all circumstances) while fighting to gain as much as possible from the North. (In the North, according to this division, is included all states up to the Rocky Mountains.) Stating the problem in terms of the class distribution of forces, the New Deal must depend mainly upon labor and the farmers, by representing the basic interests of these groups, while fighting for as much support as possible from the professional people, small business men and independent industrialists, and exerting maximum influence among political-professional and party-worker circles by the inducement of holding the only possibility of their sharing in office and power. The last statement of the problem holds for both Convention and election, but the relative importance of the various factors varies as between Convention and election; the weigh of the political-professional and party-worker circles is relatively high in the Convention and low in the election, while the weight of the labor and farmer masses is relatively low in the Convention and high in the election.

Given victory in the Democratic Convention, the New Deal coalition has before it a relatively sure road to victory in the election. It can count with a high degree of certainty upon the South, with 146 electoral votes, and the West with 65 electoral votes. That leaves a margin of but 55 electoral votes required to elect its presidential candidate, which could be provided even by two states, such as New York and West Virginia, or Illinois and Michigan, or by a combination of three or four smaller states, assuming the most unfavorable conditions.

Although a section of President Roosevelt's party is to be counted among his most bitter enemies, and holds many positions of power in government and party, it remains more than ever true that the President's leadership has united the majority of the population in his support. Roosevelt may not have the enthusiastic support of the Democratic Party machine-politicians everywhere, but he unquestionably commands the allegiance of the overwhelming bulk of the twenty-seven millions who voted for him in 1936, and a clear majority of the electorate. Even the test polls of the Gallup Institute and *Fortune* magazine, certainly not loaded in his favor, reveal this fact clearly upon analysis. The going-over to coalition with the Republicans of a section of the leaders of the President's party reflects the preponderant sentiment of the upper classes, but is exactly contrary to the current among the toiling masses and the unemployed, and especially among the industrial workers, the largest single group of the electorate.

CANDIDATES AND THE "THIRD TERM" QUESTION

The progressive and democratic majority is a *coalition* between the Democratic Party and the indepen-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent radical one-third of the electorate. President Roosevelt has embodied that coalition, and by his leadership has consolidated and strengthened it. If the coalition is to continue through the 1940 election to victory, it can only be under the same type of leadership and policy. Both candidate and platform, to emerge from the Democratic Party Convention next year, must meet this test.

Inevitably there has arisen a rapidly growing mass demand that the President shall be the candidate to succeed himself. The critical condition of the world and of the nation, which demands continuity and stability of leadership of the government, which demands known and tested leadership, which renders especially dangerous any step which would break up the present *majority coalition*—these considerations have already brought millions to the conclusion that the tradition against a third term in the Presidency must be set aside, at least for the present time of emergency, and that Roosevelt must be called again to that post. Since the issue is being raised so insistently by ever-growing masses, has emerged into public newspaper discussion, and is becoming of central importance to the alignments for 1940, the time has come when we also must begin to establish an attitude to the question.

The Communist Party, of course, is not and will not be committed to any candidate except its own. But there are millions of individuals, who are not prepared to vote for the Communist candidate, but who will want the considered opinions of the Communists as their most reliable aid in finding the most effective and practical course for themselves in solving this and similar problems. Therefore, we may submit for their consideration a few observations on the "third term" question, from the viewpoint of the masses who have united around the New Deal.

It would seem that the guiding thought, in choice of candidate, must be to find that individual who best represents, and who can best consolidate, that coalition of forces demonstrated in the twenty-seven million majority of the 1936 election. That leading consideration excludes immediately two types of candidate—one, the type of the Garner-Glass-Wheeler forces, which would unquestionably reduce the Democratic Party vote down to its normal one-third of the total; the other, such a candidate who, while acceptable to the broad radical wing, would be quite unable to gather the support of the South and the middle-of-the-road elements of the North. In short, the candidate who can continue and strengthen the coalition which Roosevelt has formed will necessarily be of the Roosevelt type. The issue of the "third term" has arisen in its insistent character precisely because there is not to be seen upon the political scene an obvious candidate of the "Roosevelt type" except Roosevelt himself. Perhaps such a candidate will come forward before the decision must be made, and that is to be hoped for, but certainly his shadow does not fall heavily upon the scene today.

Failing the materialization of such a candidate, possessed of all the essential attributes of Roosevelt, but lacking the eight years' experience in the White House which carries with it the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tradition against the "third term"—what then? Shall the twenty-seven million New Deal voters allow their unity to be shattered, with the inevitable consequence of handing a cheap victory to the Tory Republican Party, rather than break the tradition against a "third term"? Or shall they drive forward to victory again with Roosevelt, despite that tradition?

The anti-third-term tradition derives all its force from considerations of preserving democracy against the crystallization of a permanent ruling bureaucracy that might impose itself against the will of the majority. In this instance, however, the tradition would seem to be working in the opposite direction, namely, to deny to the majority the right to choose its preferred candidate solely because he had twice before been chosen, and to threaten the break-up and defeat of that majority, giving victory by default to the reactionaries. In the light of this situation, the tradition loses much of its popular appeal.

The tradition becomes a vital weapon for democracy when faced with a President who, removed from and out of sympathy with the masses, might wish to perpetuate himself by force of machine politics and governmental pressure upon a reluctant electorate. Roosevelt is accepted by the progressive forces as the extreme opposite of such a type. He stands on the same plane as Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, in his close and sympathetic connection with the masses. He is in sharpest conflict with the machine-politicians of his own party. He has made notable contributions in removing governmental pressures from the electorate. The New Deal forces are therefore led to the conclusion that if he is named for a third term, that will be an outstanding victory of the democratic masses over all the anti-democratic forces that hate him so bitterly precisely because of his characteristics. These facts also serve to remove much of the popular force of the old tradition.

All new and untried bourgeois republics have found it necessary to protect themselves against perpetuation in office of the chief executive, either by establishment of a strong tradition, such as that laid down by Washington and Jefferson in the youth of the United States, or by constitutional prohibition of even a second term, as in Mexico, on pain of paying for failure to do so with serious distortions of their democratic development. The United States is no longer, however, in the category of a new and untested experiment. For one hundred and fifty years it has been gaining experience in democratic self-government; and it seems not unreasonable to think that this makes possible, in the exceptional crisis now facing the U.S. and the world, the suspension of this safeguarding tradition when it so obviously defeats the immediate democratic will, without too serious danger to the future of democracy. This consideration further detracts from the popular force of the anti-third-term tradition in 1940.

Among the working class, particularly that section with trade union experience, the anti-third-term tradition as a rigid dogma will have little force. The workers have learned in their trade unions that while they need frequent opportunity to change their officers, in order to put them to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

test and eliminate the unrepresentative, incompetent and corrupt, yet they defeat their own ends when they bind themselves against re-election for any number of terms of the most tested, capable and popular officials. All experiments in anti-third-term or anti-second-term traditions and rules in the trade unions have broken down because in the long run they have been found to defeat and destroy democracy. And so the working class voters will not be much disturbed by the appeal to the tradition against their desire for Roosevelt's re-election.

We may sum up this consideration of the third-term issue, from the standpoint of the New Deal, as it relates to the Democratic Party Convention, by saying that it seems advisable to find a new candidate of the Roosevelt type, capable of uniting all the forces of the New Deal *coalition;* but that failing the appearance soon of such a candidate in the field, it would be an anti-democratic stupidity to allow the tradition, however sanctified by age and progressive origin, to deny democracy the chosen leader necessary to victory in the most critical moment of national and world history.

The question becomes even sharper and clearer, in case the Democratic Party Convention is dominated by the Garner-Glass-Wheeler forces, and adopts a candidate and platform of their type. In that case the New Deal democracy, having nothing to choose between Republican and Democratic Parties and candidates, must have been prepared for, and will have no choice but to launch its own new party organization—in which case Roosevelt will certainly be demanded by the masses as the candidate for victory. Any staunch New Dealer who can be named by the Democratic Convention can be elected, but against reactionary candidates on both old party tickets, the President, supported by a firm New Deal coalition, could provide the surest *guarantee* of victory.

Many progressives steeped in the traditions of our American history, are still somewhat confused and embarrassed to find the Tories and reactionaries wielding the sword of an old democratic tradition as the sharpest ideological weapon of reaction at the moment. They should remember that the same sort of thing has often occurred at other times and with other issues. States' rights doctrine was one of Jefferson's chief ideological weapons, but after 1800 it was seized by the traitorous Federalists for anti-democratic ends; it became the flag of the reactionary camp against Andrew Jackson, one of the greatest American democrats; it was used to justify secession, and the break-up of the Union, by the slave-power of the South, in 1861; and today it is found in the arsenal of the Tory Republican high command directed against the New Deal. Similarly, the Monroe Doctrine, originally an instrument for advancing independence and democracy in the Americas, became transformed, at the turn of the twentieth century, into the very symbol of imperialist oppression and exploitation over Latin America by Wall Street, and is only now in process of being transformed into its opposite and original significance again.

The recent Chicago municipal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election has demonstrated once more how important are all these local electoral battles. One by one the old political machines based upon patronage, finding their foundation undetermined by the crisis and rising democratic mass movement, are breaking up; some of them, or part of the forces combined in them, try to find a new base among the masses; they have learned that this is only possible by a fundamental shift of policy and practice, to cease the mere lip-service to the New Deal and become its active exponents and practitioners in their communities. Every such development should receive the encouragement and cooperation of the entire progressive camp. The big change in the municipal life of Los Angeles is a different form of development of the same movement to bring the New Deal into the cities as a practical matter. A number of important municipal elections are scheduled during 1939, in which proper and energetic work can greatly strengthen the foundations of the national democratic and progressive movement for 1940.

From the foregoing analysis of the relationship of class forces in the country the following can be safely concluded: The surest way for the democratic forces to prevent pro-fascist reaction from winning the government in 1940 would be with a New Deal candidate for the office of President, a candidate of the political position of President Roosevelt.

However, in saying this we have not said all. To insure such a victory will require the greatest exertion of effort by the masses of the people, by the independent mass organizations and mass movement of the workers, farmers and middle classes. It will require, in other words, a most serious and sustained political struggle against the offensive of Big Business reaction from now until Election Day. It will require concerted daily action by the masses themselves, at the bottom, in the localities and municipalities, on the major political issues facing the country, such as the struggle for jobs, security, democracy and peace. For it cannot be denied that the weakest spot in the armor of the progressive camp is the insufficient self-activity and struggle of the masses themselves for the realization of the major demands of the democratic front platform and in support of the progressive measures of President Roosevelt's Administration.

Particular stress at the present time must be put on the struggle against the offensive of monopoly reaction, on the issues arising from the economic crisis, on such question as jobs for the unemployed, security of employment, economic help to the farmers and to the middle classes, as well as an intensified struggle for adequate relief to the unemployed. And it is evident that the country is coming to a point where drastic measures have to be taken by the government to check the offensive of the reactionaries on these issues and to open the way for economic recovery.

Already at the Tenth Convention of our Party we urged, together with the labor movement generally and the progressive farm movement, a program of action looking toward the development of a national housing program, and the nationalization of the railroads, large banks and munitions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industries. Life since then has definitely proved that only such measures as these could lift the country out of the economic crisis, check the sabotage of Big Business, and open the way to economic recovery in the interests of the people.

Therefore, we say that the surest way to prevent reaction from winning the government in 1940 is for the masses themselves and their independent organizations, economic and political, to unfold a sustained and concerted struggle, in the industries, on the farms and in the localities, for the major demands of the democratic front platform which undeniably express the wish of the majority of our people. This would mean, naturally, that the trade union movement would place the question of jobs and security of employment in the very center of their activities and struggles in the industries, carrying on such activities in closest contact with the political struggles of the masses in support of the progressive measures of President Roosevelt. This would mean, similarly, that on the farms and in the farm organizations, policies would be pursued to lead the farm masses in daily struggle for their economic demands on a local and state scale, again in closest contact with the political struggles on a national scale in support and for the improvement of the progressive agrarian plans of the New Deal. Similarly with the middle classes, and with the Negro people. In short, as we said at the Tenth Convention of our Party, the American people have not only the right to demand progressive measures; they also have the duty to fight for them, and this is today truer than it ever was before. It is the only guarantee for victory in 1940.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND THE ELECTION ISSUES OF 1940

The continued and deepening depression of the economic life of the country is the foundation for most of the issues of political struggle around which the population is realigning itself. For ten years United States economy has not even kept pace with the growth of population, while the maldistribution of the decreased production becomes ever more pronounced. Even such recovery as took place from the depths of the crisis returned an ever smaller proportion of workers to their jobs, due to accentuated rationalization, mechanization and speed-up. The simplest and most immediate problems of life, how to keep a minimum supply of food, clothing and shelter at the disposal of the mass of the population, become ever more difficult and pressing. No political party, group or leader would think of denying these facts any more; all issues of domestic policy refer immediately to these facts as granted.

There are people who see the relation of economic activity to the political struggle of 1940 in a very simple and mechanical formula. They say, if there is economic recovery, that will turn the tide toward the New Deal and return it to power, while if there is continued or deepened economic stagnation, that will turn the rising discontent of the masses against those now in power and in favor of the reactionary Republican Party as the only practical alternative. But we must reject this short-sighted and abstract view, which leads to passivity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and fatalism, playing right into the hands of the reactionary forces.

The renewed economic crisis from the middle of 1937, from which there has been only partial recovery, arose upon the basis of economic factors inherent in the capitalist mode of economy. But the time it occurred, its precipitancy and depth were conditioned upon two major political influences; one, the "sit-down strike of big capital," the declaration of "lack of confidence in the government" on the part of monopoly capital, was the most important; the other was the weakening and partial withdrawal of government intervention in economy, the retreat made by the New Deal under pressure of monopoly capital's attack.

The attacks by monopoly capital, whether these are economic or political, against the masses and the New Deal, need not and should not weaken the mass support of the New Deal; on the contrary, it should strengthen and consolidate that support. And to the extent that such attacks further depress the national economy, it should strengthen the determination and fighting spirit of the masses to enforce their program, which is being sabotaged by the reactionaries. The retreats and weakenings of the New Deal under these attacks, of course, are an entirely different matter; such retreats unquestionably weaken and demoralize the mass support of the New Deal, and open the way for reactionary demagogy. The answer, then, is that when and if the New Deal fights for measures in the interests of the masses, it strengthens its position politically, regardless of whether the economy is going up or down; and when it weakens in that fight, it weakens its mass support, again regardless of whether economy is going up or down.

Reactionary agents of monopoly capital, dominating the Republican Party and the Right-wing Democrats, raise the demagogic cry: "Are you satisfied to remain all your life on W.P.A. jobs at a starvation wage? Abolish the W.P.A. and other New Deal measures, and private employment at regular wages will come back." Obviously, this demagogy flies in the face of well-known facts, such as the fact that the crisis came as the climax of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover regimes, of unconditional domination by finance capital, with out any W.P.A. or any of the reforms of the New Deal, which did not prevent the throwing of fifteen millions out of private employment; such as the fact that Hoover prevented for three years of the crisis any governmental interference in economy, with the result that the economic life of the country came almost to a complete standstill; such as the fact that whatever degree of recovery there has been since 1933 came as a result of governmental intervention and New Deal reforms, that recovery weakened when the New Deal retreated, and gained when the government again strengthened its economic intervention. Facts are stubborn things, and these are obvious and undeniable facts. We must never allow them to be forgotten. In this issue we have the crux of the economic problems of the country, as they are being worked out by the great majority of the people, who have not yet come to understand the advantage and necessity of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an entirely new economic system, of socialism, and who will find that understanding only through struggle and experience.

It is a fact broadly recognized that private capitalist enterprise, unassisted by large-scale and increasing governmental intervention, cannot and will not bring about recovery of the nation's economy. Increasing accumulations of idle capital and idle manpower can be united in productive activity to increase the nation's wealth and provide a measure of livelihood for the masses, not by removing the government from the economic field, but, on the contrary, only by constantly increasing governmental initiative, activity and control in certain specified branches of the national economy.

This is true not only of the accepted field of public works, which private capital never pretended to develop. It is especially obvious in the question of housing, to take one example. There is an acute housing shortage in the country, with the result of rising rents and deteriorating housing standards, and intolerable social and economic burdens growing heavier day by day. An expenditure of five billion dollars per year on housing designed for mass use would require many years to cover this shortage. Everybody knows that private capitalist enterprise cannot and will not carry out such a building program. Yet machinery, materials, capital and men are present in abundance within the country only waiting and anxious for the effective order to do the job. Obviously, such an effective order can come only from the government, based upon a large-scale and long-term program. Equally obviously, such a housing program would be the greatest stimulus to the national economy generally.

Of course, reactionary spokesmen for monopoly capital have many arguments against any such program, which they shout from the housetops and in the columns of almost every newspaper. Most of these arguments are bogey-men to cover up the real underlying motive, which is greed and desire for greater exploitation of the people. Let us examine one of these bogey-men in some detail, to expose its fundamentally false character. Take the argument that such a large-scale housing project, by further expanding the national debt, would lead toward national bankruptcy and financial collapse. Dig to the bottom of that argument, and what do we find?

Suppose that a private capitalist enterprise, a huge corporation, could be imagined to have been formed, raising five billion dollars capital each year for five years, a total of twenty-five billion dollars, for such a large-scale housing construction program as we have envisaged. It issues its capital obligations, certificates of one form or another, whether stocks or bonds is not important; that is, it goes into debt to the amount of twenty-five billion dollars. At the end of five years, however, it holds assets, in the form of a great system of planned housing, to the value not merely of the twenty-five-billion-dollar investment, but that amount *plus the enormous super-profits of the extortionate rents now being paid for sub-standard housing*—a part of which could be passed on to the tenants in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the form of lower costs, and a part of which could be capitalized by the corporation over and above its original investment, after paying normal interest on its capital.

Now, if that were done by a private capitalist corporation, would our reactionaries cry out that the twenty-five-billion-dollar capital debt would lead the nation toward bankruptcy and financial collapse? Of course not, they would hail it as a feat of capitalist genius, the source of true national prosperity, particularly if the corporation had passed on but a minimum of the benefits to its tenants and had capitalized the gains mainly for its owners to the tune of 25 or 30 per cent profit on the original capital.

If such an enterprise would be a great boon to the nation, when carried out by a private corporation, why would it not be an equal or even greater boon if carried out by the government, or by *a corporation organized and directed by the government*? What would make it a benefit in the one case and a disaster in the other? Clearly, the chief if not the only economic difference in the two cases would be that private enterprise would direct the benefits chiefly toward the capital investors, while governmental enterprise would direct the benefits chiefly toward the larger group of the consumers of the housing.

There is the further, and crucial, difference between the two opposing conceptions of how to carry out such a housing program. That is, that private capital is incapable of doing it, and even if it were capable would be entirely unwilling, because it has too many vested interests in the old sub-standard housing which would be retired from use; while the government would be entirely capable of doing the job in the most effective manner—provided only that in the governmental position of power were representatives of the people and not of the private capitalist interests.

Thus we find by the simplest and most direct examination of the reactionary arguments against a serious and large-scale governmental program for economic recovery, that these arguments are directed not at all to the protection of the national interest, but to the protection of monopoly capital interests at the expense of the nation.

There is the further argument that such a housing program, for example, would be the entering wedge of socialism, which by destroying the confidence of private capitalists would bring all the rest of economy to paralysis, and thus force either complete socialization or abandonment of the governmental project. Such argument is only a threat by monopoly capital that it will go on strike if the government undertakes any projects of which it disapproves. Actually, such a housing program would not be either socialism or its beginnings. It would take place entirely within the framework of the capitalist economy, according to its form and rules, and would no more be socialist than the governmental ownership and operation of railroads that has prevailed in most European countries for generations. It would merely supplement the system of private capital, by doing those things which private capital alone is unable or unwilling to do, and which are necessary for the continued existence of society.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A real socialist housing program would be entirely different thing, and, may we add, a much better one, but since the great majority of the population of the U.S. is not ready for socialism, we cannot expect our socialist conception of housing to be adopted immediately. But the choice is not between no housing program at all, or the really socialist program; the immediate choice is between the present almost complete absence of an effective housing program, and a serious and large-scale extension of New Deal principles into the housing problem under the present capitalist system, which would have tremendous consequences in stimulating the whole economy of the nation.

The basic principle of this discussion on housing can be applied, with only minor modifications, to a few key points in the national economy, and also apply in the main to the whole question of public works also. There is not the slightest danger to the national economy in governmental debts which represent the putting to work of idle capital and idle men in the production of socially necessary and useful things; on the contrary, that is the only possible road toward national salvation, short of the complete socialist reconstruction of the country.

Or, consider the problems of the farmers, in relation to the New Deal program.

The majority of farmers find their economic problems becoming more difficult, their share of the national income declining, and as a result they are stirred with discontent with the New Deal which failed to help them as much as it promised. The Republican Party has been speculating on this discontent, and turning much of it to their advantage, despite their complete failure to propose any counter-program to that of the New Deal. It must be said, in fact, that while the New Deal performed for the farmers much more than the Harding, Coolidge and Hoover Administrations, all its farm measures have had one fundamental defect—that they were merely improved versions of the same policies that were inaugurated by the Republican Party.

Hoover, when President, made the first proposal to "plow under every third row" as a measure of crop control and McNary, Republican leader in the Senate, is the original father in Congress of export subsidies. The New Deal refined and improved the crude Republican measures and proposals, and eliminated some of their worst features. But it did not depart from their basic principles, and failed to find a fundamentally democratic basis for its farm program.

All New Deal farm measures passed their greatest benefits to the minority of well-to-do farmers, reached the middle farmers only with the crumbs and leavings, and actually helped to drive off the land a large part of the sharecroppers and poor tenants. Thereby they strengthened that stratum traditionally Republican and anti-New Deal, neglected the mass of New Deal farm supporters, and actually injured the lowest stratum which should have been the main support of the New Deal in the countryside. There can be no serious consideration of winning the farming masses back to the New Deal that does not begin with measures that build

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the lower-income farm groups, not the higher-income groups. To neglect this means to surrender domination of the countryside to the reactionary camp.

It seems absolutely clear, in the matter of program, that the New Deal coalition can maintain and consolidate its majority in the country, only by fearlessly *pressing forward* along the lines already indicated in established legislation but not yet fully realized, while any retreat or compromise on the key issues of this program can only weaken and undermine that majority. That is the answer to all the timid advice that is showered upon the New Deal leadership, advising it to go slow, to compromise, or to retreat. To follow a timid leadership now is the sure road to destruction for the New Deal coalition.

[*This is a section of the report delivered by Comrade Browder to the Plenary Meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held in New York City, May 6 to 8, 1939. The full text of the report has been issued in pamphlet form, under the title,* The 1940 Elections—How the People Can Win, *Workers Library Publishers, New York.*—The Editors.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAND OF SOCIALISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

BY GEORGI DIMITROFF

I.

THIS year the working class throughout the world is celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of May Day—the day of international proletarian solidarity.

In 1889, May Day was established as a day of fraternal solidarity of the workers of all lands, as a day of militant review of the forces of the proletariat, as a day of the struggle of labor against capital.

Small units of the working class began to keep this day in different countries. But with every year that passed the proletarian May Day celebrations grew and spread to an increasing extent. The workers declared strikes, came out onto the streets, carried through tremendous demonstrations, and from year to year strengthened the bonds of their international solidarity.

But as time went on the *revolutionary Marxists* and the *reformists* began to observe May Day *in different ways*. The Bolshevik Party, the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, celebrated this day, from the beginning, as a day of revolutionary struggle. It fought for the daily needs of the working class and at the same time it prepared the workers' forces for the oncoming revolutionary battles against the tsarist autocracy and capitalism.

In a leaflet written by Comrade Stalin for May Day, 1912, the Bolshevik Party proclaimed to the whole of Russia, then groaning under tsarist yoke, that:

> ". . . We must on this day say . . . that we swear to fight for the complete overthrow of the tsarist monarchy, that we welcome the oncoming Russian Revolution, the liberator of Russia. . . . Down with capitalism! Long live socialism!"

Nothing could prevent the Bolsheviks from celebrating May Day in revolutionary fashion: neither persecution by the tsarist police, nor the economic pressure of the capitalists, nor the furious resistance of the Mensheviks, who opposed the celebration of May Day in a revolutionary manner.

An absolutely different approach to the celebration of May Day was made by the reformists. They were assiduous in depriving May Day of its revolutionary significance. They transformed May Day from a day of the demonstration of international pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letarian solidarity and of the militant review of the forces of the proletariat into a vulgar festival, inoffensive to the bourgeoisie. And here, in this question of the attitude to the character and content of May Day there was manifested, decades ago, the profound difference in principle between the two paths in the world labor movement—*the path of reformism* and the *path of Bolshevism,* which subsequently led to two absolutely contrary results.

Reformism, which splits the working class, shows lack of confidence in the workers' strength and in their victory, and subordinates their movement to the interest of the exploiting classes, rendered it possible for the bourgeoisie in the period of supreme revolutionary upheavals to save itself, to prolong the existence of the system of capitalist slavery and to proceed to the offensive against the working people. Reformism has placed the working class and the peoples of a number of capitalist countries under the yoke of the fascist regime of barbarism and brigandage.

Bolshevism, which unites the forces of the working class, mobilizes and leads it to an irreconcilable struggle against the exploiting classes, brought about the triumph of the great October Socialist Revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

And in the light of the results of these two different trends in the world labor movement, the working peoples of the capitalist world are becoming increasingly convinced of the *ruinous character of the path of reformism* and of the policy of conciliation with the imperialist bourgeoisie, of the *ruinous character of* surrender to the class enemy, and of *the correctness of the path of Bolshevism,* as indicated by the great continuers of Marxism, the leaders and teachers of the international proletariat—Lenin and Stalin.

It is with a feeling of pride, admiration and enthusiasm that on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of May Day, the proletariat and the working people of all lands celebrate the great historic victory won by the working class, which has established a socialist society on one-sixth of the earth's surface. The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. testifies to the mighty creative power of the working class. It shows clearly on the basis of the example of a tremendous country situated in the middle of the world, the all-conquering power of the proletariat, which is destined to liberate mankind from the yoke of capitalism and to establish a free, happy, classless socialist society.

It is as its own supreme achievement that the international proletariat celebrates the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. This victory is a triumph of international proletarian solidarity, a basis and a source of inspiration for the working class in its further struggle. The fraternal international solidarity of the workers of all lands, under whose banner they are demonstrating on May Day, has an indestructible material basis in the shape of the U.S.S.R.

During the historic Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), the land of socialism faced the whole of mankind in the splendor of its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strength, of its increasing riches, of the full bloom of the creative forces of liberated labor. Tremendous progress in all spheres of industry, agriculture, culture, science and art were noted by the Soviet people and together with them by the working people of all lands.

On the basis of the victory of socialism there has been achieved the moral and political unity of the Soviet people—a unity unparalleled anywhere else in the world. The working class, peasantry and the intelligentsia are joined together in a powerful united front, into a solid army of builders of communism.

At a time when the capitalist states are torn by the most profound internal contradictions, and are in the throes of war, crisis and general confusion, the Soviet country is without upheaval of any kind, and stands as a monolithic, indestructible force.

Whereas, in the world of capitalism, crisis, which dooms millions of working people to poverty, hunger and degeneration, reigns, here, on the contrary, in the land of socialism, there is unparalleled economic progress, which brings general prosperity, and a free and happy life to the people. Whereas, in the capitalist world, a bitter class struggle is being waged—as a consequence of the capitalist system of society—here, on the contrary, in the land of socialism, the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia know nothing of class discord in their midst, and are united in an unbreakable alliance.

Whereas, in the world of capitalism, we see the glorification of brute nationalism and the cultivation of the hatred of nations by other nations, in the land of socialism, on the contrary, friendship reigns between the peoples and there is a cooperation, the like of which history has not yet seen, between numerous nations, constituting a splendid embodiment of internationalism.

Whereas, in the capitalist world, sanguinary wars are raging, and the fascist cultures are making onslaughts on peaceful peoples, here on the contrary, the socialist state, and the entire great Soviet people stand on guard over the frontiers of the fatherland of the international proletariat, and defend the cause of peace, which corresponds to the interests of all nations. Through the lips of Comrade Stalin, the great Soviet people declares that it stands for the support of the peoples which have fallen victim to aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

The Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), once again demonstrated to the whole world that no intrigues and machinations of the enemy will succeed in shaking the indestructible might of the land of socialism and the iron solidarity of the entire Soviet pople around the Party of Lenin and Stalin. The Trotskyite-Bukharinite hirelings of fascism have been utterly smashed and their contemptible names fill the masses of the people with a profound hatred.

Having purged itself of the Trotskyite and other agents of fascism and the foreign secret services, the Soviet country has strengthened itself still further and is marching on with still greater rapidity.

Having splendidly fulfilled two Stalinist Five-Year Plans, the Soviet people is firmly and confidently set-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ting about the fulfillment of the Third Five-Year Plan endorsed by the Congress. Having secured the victory of socialism, the Bolshevik Party outlined in Comrade Stalin's speech, new, tremendous, breath-taking perspectives. The completion of the construction of socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism are raised as the practical tasks of the day. The slogan of communism, which implies the fulfillment of the great principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need" inspires the Soviet people to carry on the struggle for new victories and serves as a source of tremendous inspiration for the proletariat and the working people of the whole world.

In the eyes of the workers of all lands, the successes of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. signify the victory of their own cause. They are vitally interested in these successes and in the further strengthening and development of the land of socialism. Bound up with it is the entire fate of the international proletariat, and its liberation. The working class of the capitalist countries see in the growth and consolidation of the Soviet Union a life-giving force, one that strengthens their faith in their own strength and in their liberation from the yoke of capitalism.

In the concluding part of his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), Comrade Stalin with unsurpassed clarity and conviction showed the significance of the victory of socialism, won by the working class in the U.S.S.R., for the working class of the capitalist countries.

"The chief conclusion to be drawn," said Stalin, "is that the working class of our country, having abolished the exploitation of man by man and firmly established the socialist system, has proved to the world the truth of its cause. That is the chief conclusion, for its strengthens our faith in the power of the working class and in the inevitability of its ultimate victory.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that, having destroyed the old bourgeois system, the working class is incapable of building anything new to replace the old. The working class of our country has proved in practice that it is quite capable not only of destroying the old system but of building a new and better system, a socialist system, a system, moreover, to which crises and unemployment are unknown.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that the peasantry is incapable of taking the path of socialism. The collective farm peasants of our country have proved in practice that they can do so quite successfully.

"The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus perpetuate capitalist victory. For the bourgeoisie knows that if capitalism has not yet been overthrown and still continues to exist, it has not itself to thank, but the fact that the proletariat has still not faith enough in the possibility of its victory. It cannot be said that the efforts of the bourgeoisie in this respect have been altogether unsuccessful. It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and scepticism. If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our Party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case."*

---

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 61-62. International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These splendid words of Comrade Stalin point to the most fundamental thing lacking in the working class of the capitalist countries if they are to crush fascism, overthrow capitalism, and liberate themselves and their peoples from the yoke of capitalist slavery —and that is *faith in their own strength, faith in the inevitability of their victory.*

II.

The working class of the capitalist countries is facing the fiftieth anniversary of May Day in circumstances of a new imperialist war, in conditions of economic crisis and of acute struggle between fascism on the offensive and the forces of the anti-fascist movement closing their ranks against it.

An imperialist war is already in its second year, it is raging over three continents and is spreading death and destruction over the fields of China and Spain, Ethiopia and Albania, in Central Europe and distant Asia.

In spite of the fact that the ruling classes of Great Britain and France possessed the forces and the possibilities, on the basis of collective security, for firmly repulsing the fascist aggressors and preventing war from being let loose, yet by their policy of "non-intervention," by their Munich line, they pushed the people on to the bloody abyss of the destruction of millions. In their endeavor to kindle a most criminal, counter-revolutionary war—a war against the Soviet Union, to set the fascist beast of prey against the land of socialism, the British and French imperialists rendered it possible for the fascists to engage in plunder in the heart of Europe, to lay waste and rob other countries, to enslave small nations and brazenly to reshape the map of Europe with the aid of brute force. Encouraged by this policy, the appetites of the fascist aggressors have grown increasingly. Having seized Austria and Czechoslovakia, and inflicted a blow on Spain, fascism occupied Memel, occupied Albania. It is directly threatening Poland. It is stretching out its rapacious hand to the countries of the Balkan Peninsula, seeking sources of raw materials and food and hewing out a path to the East.

It is exerting pressure on Holland, Switzerland and Belgium and on the Scandinavian countries, and is engaging in machinations in the Latin American countries. The fascists are building fortifications at strategic points in the Mediterranean, preparing to lay their hands on Gibraltar and the French colonies in Africa, to seize the route to the overseas possessions of Britain and are stealthily advancing upon its colonies.

In the Far East, the Japanese militarists encouraged by this same policy of "non-intervention" by the biggest imperialist powers, are conducting a war of plunder against the Chinese people.

Begun by the fascist aggressive states, the new imperialist war, which has flared up with the downright toleration of the reactionary bourgeoisie of Great Britain and France, threatens to become transformed into a general world war.

The policy of the ruling circles of the British and French bourgeoisie—of letting loose imperialist war and of tolerating fascist brigandage on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international arena—is indissolubly connected with a pro-fascist reactionary line in their own countries.

The bourgeoisie of Great Britain and France saw in the anti-fascist movement that arose forces that could cast aside the pro-fascist friends of German and Italian fascism, that could bring to naught their agreement with the fascist aggressors. The successes of the People's Front in France, the growing solidarity of the French proletariat, the considerable progress in the labor and democratic movements of Britain, the U.S.A. and other countries, the heroic struggle of the Spanish people and the mighty campaign of international anti-fascist solidarity around this struggle, and particularly the strengthening of fraternal international solidarity and contacts between the working class of the capitalist countries and the great Soviet people—all this aroused unusual alarm among the bourgeoisie. Therefore the bourgeoisie intensified their offensive against the working class, and opened up a drive against the social achievements of the proletariat and their democratic liberties. They brought all possible weapons into action in order to frustrate the establishment of unity in the ranks of the proletariat, united action by the working class internationally, the movement of the anti-fascist people's front, and primarily of the People's Front in France and Spain.

The reactionary bourgeoisie did everything possible to stifle the Spanish republic. They did not hesitate to strike a mortal blow in the back of the heroic Spanish people, and organized the counter-revolutionary plot of Casado, Besteiro and Miaja in Madrid at the most decisive moment of the struggle of the Spanish people in defense of their country. There was no crime against the peace, liberty and independence of the peoples, to which the British and French imperialists would not resort in order to achieve agreement with the fascist aggressors, to buy off the colonial claims of fascism and to transform it into the watchdog of world reaction against the liberation struggle of the international working class and the great land of socialism.

But the British and French reactionaries again miscalculated. They have let loose forces which it is difficult for them to hold back.

It is now becoming increasingly clear to everybody that the edge of fascist aggression is now directed primarily against the West European states. The hopes of the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie to be able to drive the fascist vultures against the Soviet Union have as yet not been justified. They have not been justified, but not because fascism is giving up such plans altogether, but because the Soviet nut is too hard a one for the fascist teeth. Fascism fears that on such a venture it would not only lose its teeth, but would also break its neck, and therefore it prefers to direct its aggression along the line of least resistance.

The bankruptcy of the Munich policy of "appeasement" is so clear and indisputable that nobody, including those who created it, dares to question this now. They only seek to justify themselves by pleading that the villainy, hypocrisy and deception of their fascist partners were an unexpected surprise for them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, the events that have followed on Munich show clearly that not only did the Munich agreement not lead to peace, but that it assisted in every way in the further extension of aggression, and that instead of the imperialist contradictions being overcome, a new sharpening of them has taken place.

At the same time the letting loose of a new imperialist war, the barbarism of fascism and the criminal policy of non-intervention are calling forth a new wave of anti-fascist sentiments and of hatred for fascism and its accomplices in all countries of the world.

This mass movement finds expression in the growing opposition of the popular masses to the Munich line, in the growing resistance of the working class to the offensive of bourgeois reaction in the domestic arena, at parliamentary elections—as was the case recently in Holland and Belgium when the fascists suffered severe defeat. The eyes of millions of hitherto confused people are being opened. Pacifist illusions are falling to the ground. Hidden enemies and cunning deceivers of the people are being exposed. The hatred of the masses is growing against them. Masses who but yesterday were indifferent are being drawn into active political life and struggle. The influence of those who warned the peoples of the ruinous character of the Munich pact is growing.

Only fascist agents and deceivers of the working class can spread false legends as to the "invincibility" of fascism, and only scared capitulators and political cowards can believe such a legend.

The furious convulsions of the fascist rulers, and their boundless impudence and barbarous excesses—all these are far from being a sign of the stability of the internal strength of fascism. In resorting to fascism, the bourgeoisie did so, not out of an abundance of strength, but out of the consciousness of the shakiness of their rule. Faced with economic upheavals and a growing storm of indignation among the working people, the bourgeoisie passed over to the regime of fascist dictatorship, their calculations being that they would be able in this way to solve the internal and external contradictions of capitalism.

But what actually took place?

Fascism boasted that it would eliminate the anarchy of capitalist economy and crisis. But that, of course, proved to be beyond its strength. By means of the most severe exploitation and the plunder of the masses of the people, it succeeded in increasing the profits of the biggest capitalist sharks. But anarchy continues to corrode capitalist economic life. The notorious "planned" economy proclaimed by the fascists has boiled down simply to the transfer of the country's economic life to a basis of war economy. This, however, as Comrade Stalin stresses, cannot do away with the oncoming economic crisis, but on the contrary, is preparing the ground for a crisis of still more profound and destructive force. Before the eyes of the whole world the economic difficulties of the fascist countries are growing day by day.

Fascism demagogically announced the destruction of class contradictions and the establishment of "the com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity of the interests of the entire people," but actually the opposite took place. In its endeavor—by the employment of furious terror—to destroy the manifestations of the class struggle, fascism is driving the discontent of the masses deep down, and at the same time is rendering class contradictions still more acute. Instead of the "unification of labor and capital" we see the growth of class antagonisms. In no country is there such a profound abyss between the exploiters and the exploited as in the fascist countries. Fascism destroyed the legal organizations of the working class, but their place was taken by illegal ones. In the endeavor forcibly to smash up and crush the ranks of the labor movement, fascism is, despite its will, driving the workers to join their forces in a united proletarian front. By plundering and oppressing the peasantry and the small townsmen, fascism is driving these sections of the population to form an alliance with the proletariat, to establish an anti-fascist people's front.

The bourgeoisie saw in the fascist regime a means of rooting out the Communist movement and of doing away with the danger of revolution. However, the admissions of the fascist rulers themselves and the mobilization of the entire state machine against "the communist danger" and the people's front movement testify to the fact that the growth of the forces of revolution is going on without a break, that the working class is not ceasing its struggle and that the sympathies of the laboring people for communism are stronger now than ever before.

Fascism has established enormous armies for its wars of conquest, but there are in the ranks of these armies hundreds of thousands of armed people who are filled with hatred for fascism. And fascism's own hinterland constitutes a portentous danger to it in case of a military clash.

With the tolerance of the reactionary bourgeoisie of Britain and France, fascism has succeeded in seizing foreign territories, but it has thereby set against itself new millions of the peoples enslaved by it, and has sharply increased the number of its mortal enemies.

All this is clear proof that behind the outer facade of the fascist dictatorship profound processes are maturing of enormous revolutionary strength. All this is proof of the instability and shakiness of the fascist regime. Beneath the feet of the fascist brigands the ground is burning, a volcano is smouldering, the hot lava of which will sweep aside the fascist dictatorship, and what is more, capitalism itself.

III.

Fascism, however, will not collapse of itself. It will not give up the further letting loose of war. The reactionary bourgeoisie will not voluntarily change its course. Only the resolute struggle of millions of the proletariat and of all working people can bar the way to fascist aggression, prevent war and curb reaction.

What is it that makes possible the offensive of the fascist aggressors and their savage attacks?

The main reason essentially is that fascist aggression and the letting loose of imperialist war, which are taking

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place with the tolerance of the ruling circles of the bourgeois-democratic countries, have not as yet met with the necessary rebuff from the masses of the people. But they are not meeting with this rebuff because the working class of the capitalist countries have not succeeded in overcoming the split in their ranks, in coming forward in a united front and in winning over their allies—the peasantry and the working people of the towns.

The Communist International has on more than one occasion pointed out that if it has not proved possible hitherto to secure the establishment of united action by the working class International, this is so because reactionary leaders of the Socialist Parties and of the trade unions systematically spread the opium of superstitions regarding the stability of the bourgeois system, regarding the impossibility of a successful struggle being conducted against the fascist aggressors, spread lack of faith in the strength of the working class, and use all sorts of excuses to sabotage and frustrate the unification of the ranks of the proletariat.

These reactionary leaders, bound up in the closest degree with the ruling classes of their respective countries, fear the victory of the working class no less than the bourgeoisie does, and are at one with it in all fundamental questions of international and domestic policy.

They play skillfully on the pacifist sentiments of the masses, speculate on the legalist illusions that have been developed in the course of many decades, make use of the workers' attachment to their old organizations, and threaten to split these organizations should the united front with the Communists be established.

A striking demonstration of the splitting, capitulatory line of these leaders is provided by the May Day Manifesto of the Second International.

At a time when the flames of imperialist war threaten to engulf the whole world, when fascism is preparing new onslaughts, new acts of plunder, new nefarious deeds, when reaction is raising its head everywhere against the working class, the manifesto of the Second International passes by, in deathly silence, the question of the need for rallying the forces of the working class for the struggle against fascism and war.

In this manifesto there is not a single word about the supreme achievement of the workers of all lands, about the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, however, the astonished reader learns from the Second International's manifesto about the successes of socialism . . . in New Zealand and the Scandinavian countries. The ill-starred authors of the manifesto imagine that they will be able by this "Scandinavian Socialism"—an invention fit to make a cat laugh—to undermine the attachment of millions of workers throughout the world for the great land of socialism. Miserable, ridiculous creatures!

The masses of workers have the right to ask: *What sort of Socialists are these, when they come out against real, genuine socialism?*

What sort of leaders of the labor movement are these, when not only do they fail to use the example of the U.S.S.R. to show the great creative power and victory of the working

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class, but stubbornly endeavor, in some way at least, to weaken the significance of this victory in the eyes of the workers of these countries?

What sort of supporters of peace are these, what sort of defenders of the interests of the peoples menaced by the danger of fascist aggression, when, by their action against the U.S.S.R., by their sabotage of united working class action, they are helping the fascists and their accomplices among the imperialist cliques of other countries to set alight the flames of a new world war?

We Communists know that in the world labor movement the forces of the supporters of united working class action are growing and gathering strength, that ever-wider circles of workers are powerfully raising their voices on behalf of the establishment of unity.

We also know that profound processes of differentiation are taking place within the Second International, that with every passing day increasing numbers of leading figures in the ranks of Social-Democracy and the trade unions are giving expression to the will of the workers by more and more determinedly raising the question of the establishment of a united front with the Communist Parties.

While the Executive Committee of the British Labor Party expels Cripps for his campaign on behalf of the people's front, numerous members and even entire branches of this party and of the trade unions are declaring against the decision of the Executive Committee and are supporting Cripps.

While Paul Faure's "Munich" group in the Socialist Party of France is doing everything possible to disrupt the united front, the majority of the party is declaring resolutely for the united front with the Communists and for the anti-fascist people's front. Such facts are no longer isolated ones. Their number is growing without interruption.

And we are firmly convinced that the day is not far distant when, under the pressure of the millions of the working class, this united front will become an accomplished fact.

No force will stop this inevitable historic process. It is imperatively demanded by the entire course of events, and primarily by the need to struggle against the war of plunder being kindled by the fascist aggressors.

On this basis, the Communist International once again addresses to the Second International and the International Federation of Trade Unions an appeal to establish united action.

In its May Day Manifesto, the Executive Committee of the Communist International declared:

"Expressing the will of the working class of all countries, the Communist International proposes to the executives of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions immediately to commence negotiations regarding the establishment of a united front for struggle against the instigators and incendiaries of war. The Communist International proposes to the Labor and Socialist International a platform for unity of action—defense of peace on the basis of determined repulse to the fascist aggressors, the organization of collective security, the struggle in each capitalist country against the treacherous policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie who seek agreement with the fascist aggressors, to the detriment of the liberty and independence of their own nation.

"The Communist International proposes that a conference of labor organizations of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole world be convened to draw up a concrete plan of action, to map out ways and means of struggle, to devise a single organ for the coordination of joint action." *

And he who really stands for the interests of the working class, who really sees in bloodthirsty fascism the enemy of all working people, he who has no desire to transform the earth into a sanguinary battlefield for the sake of the interests of the bourgeoisie, cannot turn down the proposal of the Communist International.

Communists, advanced workers and all united front supporters will make this proposal of the Communist International the starting point for a mighty campaign on behalf of united action and the extensive mobilization of the masses for the struggle against fascism and war.

* * *

The decisive condition for the successful fulfilment of the tasks facing the working class of the capitalist countries is, above all, the strengthening of the Communist Parties themselves, organizationally, ideologically and politically.

Since the time of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the Communist Parties in a number of capitalist countries, by overcoming sectarianism in their ranks and tenaciously pursuing the united front tactics, have made considerable progress, extending their influence over the masses, and have become political factors of considerable weight in the life of their countries, in the life of their peoples. But our weakness is that the Communists do not always as yet consolidate their ideological and political influence in organizational forms. It is also a weakness of ours that we lag behind in the sphere of the Marxist-Leninist training of the cadres of the Communist Parties and the labor movement.

This lag provides favorable ground for the penetration of hostile influences into the ranks of the Communist Parties, for all sorts of opportunist distortions of the policy and tactics of the Parties, distortions that are exceptionally harmful particularly in conditions where the situation changes rapidly and where sharp turns are taking place in the development of events.

The Communist Parties, the militant vanguard of the working class, need constantly to study and master Marxism-Leninism, the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. They need to do so as much as they need bread, air and water. An end must be put as rapidly as possible to the disdainful attitude to theory, to the tendency towards empiricism.

The publication and distribution of Marxist-Leninist literature and particularly of the works of Lenin and Stalin, and the publication of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* in editions running into thousands of copies, which the Communist Parties have set about—all this is a welcome beginning in the direction indicated. But it is only a beginning. The task of systematically studying and really mastering this splendid book, this encyclopedia of Marxist-Leninist science, this living embodiment of the great teachings of Lenin and Stalin, and its comprehensive employment in

* See *Communist International*, April, 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries still lie ahead.

Every Communist, every advanced worker, every honest leader of the labor movement must clearly appreciate that the basic condition for the fulfilment of this historic task facing the working class is above all that the vanguard of this class master Marxist-Leninist theory and apply it in practice, that the fighters of the working class and the anti-fascist movement be armed with the powerful, victorious weapon of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECOVERY DEMANDS A BOLD PROGRESSIVE PROGRAM

BY GENE DENNIS

THE problem of economic recovery and employment, together with the issue of national security and peace, continues to dominate American political life. As 1940 approaches, this question is being placed more sharply in the forefront, for it will undoubtedly exercise a great influence in determining the outcome of the battle of '40 between the forces of progress and reaction.

Friend and foe of the New Deal alike are becoming increasingly cognizant of the issues at stake. For despite the relative improvement of the economic situation since the new economic crisis which broke out in 1937, most people recognize that recovery still remains to be fought for and won, especially since the economic upturn during the last half of 1938 has subsequently been followed by a decline in the first quarter of 1939.

The enemies of the New Deal seize upon the current critical situation in the national economy to sow confusion and division, and seek to exploit the crisis in a reactionary way, especially as a medium for bringing about a pro-fascist victory in the coming elections.

The eight and a half million jobless, plus the three millions on government work-relief, dramatize the acuteness of the present situation. The drop in national farm income by a billion dollars from 1937 to 1938 further signalizes the danger. The paralysis in private capital investment arising from the general crisis of capitalism, and accentuated by the sabotage imposed upon the country by the banks and big monopolists, likewise serves to drive home the extreme seriousness of economic stagnation and prolonged crisis.

Millions of Americans are not yet convinced that only the socialist reorganization of society will finally solve the problems of unemployment, security and social progress. But they *are* asking what is the way out of the present economic uncertainty and hardships? What is the road to jobs, security and prosperity under present conditions? Millions who support the social objectives of the New Deal and the anti-fascist orientations of the Roosevelt Administration in foreign affairs are beginning to question the soundness of the New Deal's domestic program. Many sincere progressives are beginning to waver and hesitate, and are becoming confused by the siren-calls of pro-fascist demagogy, by the sophistry of the Hoover-Taft

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"budget-balancers" and the Garner-Glass "economy bloc."

The spokesmen of Big Business, both within and outside of Congress, are flooding the country with reactionary cries for "business appeasement," "restoring confidence," "stop government spending," "revise taxation," "amend the Wagner Act," etc.

But these gentlemen, the tory Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats, and their colleagues within the labor movement, like William Green, John P. Frey, Matthew Woll and Norman Thomas, arrogantly pass over a few simple facts. To begin with, their program for "recovery" has already been tested in life—and found wanting. Their policy of curtailed government social expenditures and "incentive" taxation received unusual consideration under the Hoover regime, with the consequent effect of sharpening the national economic calamity of 1929-33. And the influence which they were able to bring to bear upon Congress in 1937, as well as in 1939, to slash drastically the relief and public works budget, as the legislative counterpart of the sitdown strike of Wall Street, helped to precipitate and deepen the new economic crisis which began in the middle of 1937 and which still grips the nation. Only today the tory "economy" drive has a more sinister purpose. It coincides with the new offensive of big capital against progressive legislation, civil liberties, the unions and the living standards of the people, and is designed to pave the way for fascism.

Among other things, the reactionary monopolists and their Garner-Vandenberg Congressional coalition hope by the raucous thunder of their anti-New Deal attacks to divert public attention from the many-sided lessons of recent economic experience and the present economic outlook. What are some of these lessons and what is the current economic perspective? These might be sketchily summarized somewhat as follows:

One of the most important factors in the economic upswing in the second half of 1938, following upon the acute crisis which set in in 1937, was direct government intervention along the lines of increased expenditures for relief, public works and housing. As against this, one of the key *retarding* elements in the economic picture was and is the economic and political sabotage of finance capital, especially evidenced in the deliberate withholding of new capital outlays and replacements in the railroad and utilities industries.

Private capital investment is not taking place in substantial quantities. Banks are not lending to stimulate private enterprise and are restricting their investments primarily to tax-exempt government securities. Monopoly capital and its Republican-Garner spokesmen in Congress oppose further federal appropriations for social measures and public investment. The economic upturn during the last half of 1938 has already given way to economic recession in the first quarter of 1939. Unemployment remains at an appalling level. The chronic farm crisis further aggravates recovery.

Fundamental government reforms such as expanded public works and large-scale housing, monopoly control, progressive tax revision, effective farm aid, social security improvement,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

etc., are retarded and obstructed in this session of Congress, due to the sabotage of the "economy bloc" of Garner-Glass Democrats and the "budget-balancing" Vandenberg-Taft-Hoover Republicans. In fact the "business appeasement" drive of the tories in Congress has become one of the most serious menaces to economic security and the national welfare. The fears and uncertainty in the international situation are further worsening the economic situation.

Therefore, everything seems set for a further drop in the business and employment index towards the end of '39 and the early part of '40. Moreover, taking into account the profound and adverse effects upon the national economy of such paramount factors as were indicated by Comrade Stalin in his historic report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, including the inevitable further growth of the economic crisis on a worldwide scale, the future course and protracted influence of the second imperialist war upon the economy and political life of all capitalist countries—the present economic outlook in the United States appears dark and uncertain.

In the light of this situation all evidence points to the fact that the direction of economic activity and the achievement of jobs and recovery, now depends to an *unusual* extent upon government action, upon the extent and character of federal intervention in the life and economy of the country, especially to stimulate private enterprise.

Any reduction or slackening of federal expenditures in the sphere of public works, relief, farm aid, old age pensions, and social welfare generally, would even more sharply reverse the economic trends of the second half of 1938, not to speak of postponing any serious steps towards economic progress.

Likewise, a policy which would limit federal action in the realms of public investment and social expenditures to the present levels—in the absence of any basic changes in the international situation—would adversely affect economic trends, would hasten the development of a new decline in industrial production and employment in the last quarters of 1939 and the first quarter of 1940, and would result in a further deepening and extension of the crisis generally.

LESSONS OF THE CURRENT ECONOMIC CRISIS

What conclusions can thus be drawn from the first two years of the present economic crisis? What lessons are to be drawn by the labor and progressive movement in the sphere of promoting economic recovery on the basis of recent experience?

1. The present cyclical economic crisis which started in 1937 takes place under special conditions, including the policy of planned sabotage by the big monopolists, which require special measures to overcome.

2. Governmental intervention in the economic life of the country, particularly to promote private as well as public investment and employment, is one of the most potent factors governing the index of recovery and employment. In 1937 a sharp reduction in federal work relief ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penditures sent the economic index into a tailspin. In the middle of 1938 increased government expenditures effectively moved production and employment ahead. The present dark economic outlook and uncertainty can be changed in a progressive manner if direct government aid in the form of expanded relief, housing, public works and farm aid is combined with additional stimulus to private investment as through the Federal Housing Administration.

3. The measures which the Roosevelt Administration took in 1938 to promote economic activity and employment, particularly through the medium of the work relief program, served to aid the people and to stimulate a degree of economic revival. But the *absence* of concerted efforts to curb the powers of the monopolies and to break the sit-down strike of big capital, restricted the positive effects of the 1938 work relief program, and delayed the advancement of serious measures to promote an upturn in the production of the means of production and the realization of general economic progress.

4. The activity, militancy, and unity of the labor movement, especially through the C.I.O. unions, in resisting the direct assaults of the open shop employers, in defeating the wage-cutting campaign, in advancing organization and collective bargaining, constitute a main driving force for achieving jobs, recovery, democracy and peace, as are particularly evidenced today in the mining industry.

5. The chronic crisis in agriculture remains one of the weakest links in the economic situation. Measures to assure farm prices corresponding to cost of production, the protection of farm tenants and adequate agricultural credit still remain to be solved. Similarly, the advancement of the nation's welfare, the development of recovery, necessitates systematic government and popular mass action to provide a suitable answer to this and allied problems.

6. An improvement in foreign trade, like expansion in domestic production and employment, is dependent chiefly upon *abnormal* measures —in the first place upon an extension of government loans and credits to the democracies, as well as upon the pursuance of a firm policy of concerted peace action to curb the fascist aggressors.

Granting that these conclusions are substantially correct, what is the way out of the present economic dilemma? What can be done, *now,* to promote economic progress and jobs? What can be accomplished in the next period, under present social conditions, to advance recovery, prosperity and democracy?

All but the blind or charlatans must admit that the reactionaries—Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats alike—offer no solution that can serve the interests of the people. The domestic program which they bring forward now, just like their program on foreign policy, is calculated to demoralize and weaken the people today and to usher in a reactionary, pro-fascist regime on the morrow. Their program for "recovery" is a program for promoting monopoly profits at the expense of the common people. Their search for "confidence" is the quest for unbridled exploitation. Their advocacy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of halting government relief and recovery expenditures is an ultimatum to slash social expenditures to the minimum, as they have proposed in Congress and enacted in states dominated by Republican majorities—in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Massachusetts and elsewhere.

And what about the New Dealers? They have advanced points of a program which, if consistently promoted, could advance the cause of recovery, jobs and social progress. They have championed, to an important, though limited, degree, government measures to provide work relief, public housing, T.V.A., farm aid, elements of social security. Yet the New Dealers blow hot and cold. They frequently mark time or retreat before an advance is completed. They often become frightened by the scope of the problem and the cries of reaction. Moreover, many New Dealers see no way ahead other than through the limited measures adopted to date. They evade pressing for a firm progressive tax program which could balance the budget in the interests of the people.

Above all, the majority of the New Dealers hesitate to move aggressively against the monopolies. Just as the positive effects of the T.V.A. program began to register in many regions, aiding recovery, driving down utility rates and encouraging rural electrification—then, just at this moment, certain influential New Deal circles capitulated to the reactionary attacks of the utility magnates and curbed the T.V.A. program. Likewise, just as the anti-monopoly investigations (Temporary National Economic Committee) began to get under way and rouse public opinion to the urgency of establishing effective monopoly controls—then, also, many New Dealers weakened and "postponed" the enactment of vital anti-monopoly legislation, such as government control of patents, federal licensing and supervision of all corporations engaged in interstate trade, and federal anti-trust action against monopoly price-fixing.

This is why many progressives and most of the New Dealers now find themselves on the defensive on the question of economic recovery in face of the political offensive of the reactionaries. This is why they have been unable to bring forward a rounded-out domestic program to meet the requirements of the present situation.

RECOVERY DEPENDS ON AN INTEGRATED PROGRAM

This leads us to the crux of the matter. For, *effectively* to promote recovery, jobs and social security today *requires an integrated governmental program of national and social security* which, among other things, will combine *serious measures to curb the powers of monopoly control* with the necessary federal appropriations for public investments in the form of large-scale housing and public works programs, such as outlined by Comrade Browder, as well as in expanded expenditures for adequate farm aid, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, etc.

Our Party, through the reports of Comrade Browder, in the resolutions of the Tenth National Convention, and at the December plenum of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Committee, has indicated the direction and main features of such a program. Yet it must be admitted that very little has been done *to popularize this program,* a program of the democratic front. Very little has been done to set in motion a broad nationwide mass movement to influence Congress to restrict and limit the economic and political powers of the big monopolists. This is why the struggle for recovery is lagging. And this is one of the main reasons why the progressives and New Dealers enter the 1940 election campaign with serious disadvantages.

What then are the main features of the democratic front program, which, if applied and supported by organized mass pressure, could materially alter the present economic situation and really stimulate recovery and employment, and thereby strengthen democracy and national security? Among these are the following:

First, a series of measures similar to those set forth by Comrade Browder, to launch a number of really extensive government or public investment programs, in the form of self-liquidating public works projects—housing, T.V.A., hospitals, roads, rural electrification, etc. The five-billion-dollar housing project advocated by Comrade Browder would employ directly a minimum of two million workers annually in housing construction, and at least another million workers in subsidiary industries. Moreover, such a project would be a public asset and not a liability, would be self-amortizing and could in no way endanger the public credit.

Secondly, a number of measures to improve radically consumer purchasing power through the medium of establishing adequate farm parity payments and ample government credit for all working farmers; of rehabilitating all farm tenants and sharecroppers; of establishing minimum old-age pensions of 60 dollars at 60 years; of inaugurating a really all-inclusive nationwide employment and health insurance program, etc. But these proposals can only be effected and could only assist the national welfare if they are financed on the basis of making the rich pay. Thus, the progressive tax program proposed by our Party for increasing income and corporate surplus tax rates in the higher brackets, for boosting gift and inheritance taxes, for ending the present loopholes for tax evasion, for abolishing tax-exempt securities, for establishing a special excess profits tax on all monopolies, etc., could raise an additional eight billion dollars in taxes annually. Such a tax program is realistic and essential if recovery and the people's income are to be seriously advanced.

Thirdly, measures designed to shorten the work-week and to improve the wage standards and thereby bolster consuming power, such as the universal enforcement of the Wagner Labor Act; the enactment of the Walsh-Healy amendments to make adherence to the Wagner Act a condition for the granting of all government contracts; the rigid application and improvement of the Wages-Hour Act; the enactment of legislation for the thirty-hour working week in all industries.

Fourthly, proposals aimed at promoting foreign trade, which consti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tutes a very important factor in raising the national income and employment. Clearly, in the present situation of fascist aggression, economic penetration and trade war, the problem of improving American exports and securing a larger share of the world market depends upon *extra-normal* methods, and again chiefly upon positive governmental action. What is especially required is a rounded-out economic program, of a democratic character, to supplement the Good Neighbor policy and the anti-fascist direction of American foreign policy generally.

Among the measures to be considered in this connection are the following: the granting of adequate credit facilities and long-term industrialization loans by the United States government at low interest rates to Mexico, Cuba, the Latin American countries and China, the funds to be expended mainly in the United States; the use of American gold reserves for currency stabilizing loans to the Latin American countries; the bartering of present stocks of wheat and cotton to the democratic countries in exchange for stocks of strategic war materials necessary to American nationl defense; special cotton loans to China and Latin America, to be used to expand their purchases of American cotton textiles as well as raw cotton.

Such proposals would be mutually advantageous to the working people of the United States and the other democracies. It would help counteract the economic instability caused by fascist economic and political aggression. It would assist the economic rehabilitation of the Americas and all non-aggressor nations. It would especially alleviate the position of the American farmers. Above all, it would aid the cause of democracy everywhere.

Fifthly, and unquestionably most important for influencing the course of the national economy, employment and welfare, as well as the direction of American foreign relations, are a series of overdue measures *once and for all drastically to curb the economic and political powers of monopoly capital.* For, without moving aggressively against the reactionary monopolies, it will be impossible to move ahead towards genuine social and national security. This is axiomatic. But this is the Achilles' heel of the New Deal.

CURB FINANCE CAPITAL

Really to promote recovery and jobs, seriously to limit the powers of finance capital—the modern monarch of social retogression and decay—measures must be taken to control and regulate the banks in the interests of the people. The banks represent the cornerstone of modern economic life. The banks today control over 53 billion dollars in deposits alone. The banks are, as Lenin said, "the main nerve centers of the entire capitalist system of national economy."

What should be done, now, to curb the power of the banks, the octupus of Wall Street? Our Party has correctly advanced the proposal to nationalize the banks, to establish government ownership of the entire banking system.

This is a modest proposition designed to place the banks in the serv-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ice of the people. It is a plan which falls far short of socialization, far short of what could be done under a socialist economy. Without moving to nationalize or control the banks in the public interest, recovery will lag, unemployment will grow and the sabotage of big capital will continue uninterrupted.

Nationalization of the banks today would mean public ownership of the banks operating within the framework of capitalism. It would not mean, nor does it require, that the banks and their property be confiscated. Nationalization of the banks under present conditions would not require any fundamental change in property relations, nor would it deprive a single owner of a single cent. For, as Lenin pointed out in his memorable pamphlet, *The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Fight it:*

"Ownership of the capital which is manipulated by the banks, and which is concentrated in the banks, is attested by printed and written certificates called stocks, bonds, notes, promissory notes, etc. None of these certificates is lost or changed when the banks are nationalized, *i.e.*, when all the banks are fused into one state bank. Whoever had 15 rubles in a savings bank account remains the owner of the 15 rubles after the nationalization of the banks, and whoever had 15 millions will still have 15 millions in the form of stocks, bonds, promissory notes, commercial paper, and the like, even after the nationalization of the banks." *

What, then, is the significance of the nationalization of the banks? Nationalization, or government ownership of the banks, would mean simply the establishment of real government control over banking operations and the merger of all banks into one state bank. Nationalization of the banks, under a progressive government and management, would provide the government with greater resources and assure it of greater independence with regard to finance capital.

Again to quote Lenin:

"The advantages from the nationalization of the banks for the whole people, and *not* especially for the workers (for the workers have little to do with banks) but for the mass of peasants and small industrialists, would be enormous. . . . Nationalization would signify a highly important step in the direction of making the use of the banks universal, in the direction of increasing the number of their branches, the accessibility of their operations, etc., etc. The accessibility and the easy terms of credit, particularly for *small* owners, for the peasantry, would increase immensely. As for the state, it would for the first time be in a position to *survey* all the main monetary operations without concealing them, then to *control* them, then to *regulate* economic life, and finally to *obtain* millions and billions for large state operations, without paying the capitalist gentlemen sky-high 'commissions' for their services.' " *

As a step towards the nationalization of the banks, it is possible and necessary for the Administration and Congress, backed by the people, to take immediate action to establish public control over the banks, and thereby to accelerate the speedometer of recovery. Legislation could and should be enacted by Congress to establish government ownership of the twelve regional Federal Reserve Banks which alone hold two-thirds of the bank assets of the country and which already are quasi-government banks. Pending this, the government

* V. I. Lenin, *The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Fight It*, pp. 13-14, Little Lenin Library.

* *Ibid.*, p. 15.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should immediately reorganize the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System and give representation on the Board to labor, the farmers and small business. It should democratize and expand the services of the existing federal loan and credit agencies, especially under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and develop a more consistent public-spirited policy in their operations. Likewise legislation should be passed to compel all private and non-member banks to join the Federal Reserve System, as well as to centralize all bank examinations under the Treasury Department.

This partial step in the direction of public ownership of the banking system would centralize lending power in the interests of the people. It could, if administered in a progressive way, establish flexible and democratic credit standards favorable to small business as well as to federal, state and city governments. It could develop greater federal authority regarding the use of banking wealth, the major part of which is now idle. It could promote on an extensive scale both public and private investment and employment beneficial to the majority of the people. It could give the people voice and influence in determining production and price policies of all corporations. It could thereby simultaneously weaken the power of monopoly capital in the political life of the country. This step, the public ownership of the banks, would constitute one of the most important measures to stimulate economic activity, to improve the national income and to safeguard the people's rights.

NATIONALIZATION OF THE RAILROADS

Another immediate problem in the sphere of nationalization and for augmenting industrial activity and jobs is that of the railroads. Government ownership of the railroads could substantially revitalize important sectors of the national economy. The government could inaugurate a vast program of rehabilitation and modernization. It would simultaneously protect the railroad workers and improve their wage standards and conditions, and extend federal labor legislation, including the Wagner Act, to the railroads, providing, of course, the existence of a progressive Congress and Board of Control.

The railroads are the nation's sick industry No. 1. In the past decade they have dismissed over a million workers. Moreover, as the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission show, expenditures of the railroads between 1932 and 1937 were $4,600,000,000 less than in the previous six years. According to R. V. Fletcher, counsel of the Association of American Railroads, the railroads should spend at least one billion dollars a year on ways and equipment for the next ten years; whereas in 1938, according to President J. J. Pelley of the Railroad Association, the carriers made capital expenditures of only $250,000,000 compared with $570,000,000 even in 1937.

Public ownership of the railroads could thereby stimulate gigantic industrial activity in necessary capital goods and employment. It could likewise result in safeguarding railway employment, as well as in cheaper railroad rates for shippers and the public, and in the introduction of a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nationwide system of grade crossings to protect the safety of the people.

Government administration of the railroads proved to be an asset in the national emergency of the last World War. Adequate measures for national defense today, as well as recovery, also require government ownership and operation of the railroads today as a national emergency measure which will help safeguard the recovery and the national welfare.

Pending such action, a number of urgent measures should and must be adopted, such as: the establishment of a government railroad board to assume ownership and control of all railroads now in the hands of receivership; government loans to the railroads for rolling stock and maintenance of way operations, on the basis of securing bonds and first mortgages for all loans; government construction and rental of one to three billion dollars of rolling stock as a national defense measure and as a means for taking a first step towards public control of railroad facilities and for increasing the volume of investment for business recovery.

The nationalization of the munitions and armaments industries is also on the order of the day as an essential prerequisite for national defense and economic recovery. For this is a proposal capable of improving the national economy, limiting monopoly sabotage of national defense, as well as helping effectively to curb war profiteering. But in this connection it should be borne in mind that any positive economic effects of current armament production upon the welfare of the country are contingent upon: (a) a sharp increase in wage standards in the munitions and armaments industries; (b) a drastic rise in taxation upon incomes and corporate surpluses now accruing to the munitions kings.

In addition to these practical proposals which should comprise an organic part of the program of the democratic front, other propositions need to be advanced and enacted into law further to curb the power of the big monopolists.

In this connection, attention should be focused on such measures as the following:

1. The establishment of government price-fixing boards to control prices in those industries which are designated as monopolies, incorporating in this as a starting point a minimum proposal for an immediate slash of 10 per cent in all prices of monopoly-controlled commodities and services, such as transportation rates.

2. The introduction of government control and compulsory licensing of all patents to all persons and all companies on equal terms.

3. The withholding of all government contracts to companies and corporations violating the Wagner Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, the Securities Exchange Commission rules, the proposed Thomas-LaFollette Oppressive Labor Practices Act, etc.

In these proposed legislative measures we have outlined, in accordance with the decisions of our Tenth National Convention, the main features of a democratic front program which today can augment industrial production and jobs, and strengthen the bulwarks of democracy and national security.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is necessary now is that this program should be translated into action. For the decisive thing to secure the enactment of these progressive measures is the adoption of a program of mass action, is the launching of a broader, united people's movement to guaranteed that this program shall become the policy of the government.

Greater organized mass pressure on Congress and the state legislatures, especially in those states dominated by reactionary Republican administrations, is essential if this program is to be enforced. This means to bring the fight for jobs, security, recovery, democracy and peace more directly and consciously into the realm of the class struggle, into the sphere of popular mass action. This means, above all, to strengthen and develop further unity of action by labor in each factory, locality, state and industry. For labor's unity, as well as its political activity to rally the farmers and city middle classes, remains the central question of the day—upon which tomorrow hinges.

This means, further, that we Communists must help develop more consistent and many-sided mass activities, on a united front basis, in support of progressive, labor and social legislation; in defense of wage standards, union and civil rights; in behalf of all other national, state and municipal endeavors to stimulate recovery and jobs, and to strengthen democracy. Among other things, we should display greater initiative in assisting to mobilize the labor unions, farm organizations, church groups, national groups and fraternal bodies, the Negro people, women and youth organizations, in the urban and rural centers, in every neighborhood and ward, to organize systematic, day-to-day actions and public pressure to carry out the planks and policy of the democratic front.

* * *

To promote its reactionary interests, monopoly capital boldly pushes forward its program and policy of curtailing social expenditures, of tax revision, "lack of confidence," demagogy, etc. By this means, combined with its sit-down strike against recovery and democracy, Big Business clearly aims to blackmail the government, strives to reduce federal expenditures, and seeks to scuttle the progressive New Deal program and existing social legislation. Reaction counts, among other things, for the New Deal to be wrecked upon the reef of high finance and the planned sabotage of private capital investment, just as in the sphere of foreign policy it strives to sabotage national defense and security. Above all, reaction counts on its policy of worsening the economic situation as a trump card for demoralizing and dividing the people and for bringing about a pro-fascist election victory in 1940.

Labor, the progressives, and the New Dealers should equally realize the gravity of the situation and the inseparable connection between the fight for economic security, democracy and peace. They should press forward more unitedly and determinedly on the legislative and economic fronts to advance the people's democratic front program. They should more consistently and skillfully smoke out the tories. They should more clearly ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose the tactics of monopoly capital which operates in Congress through the Republican Party and the Garner-Glass wing of the Democratic Party. They should throw the spotlight of public opinion on the give-and-take play where the anti-New Deal Democrats usually carry the ball and take the formal initiative in sponsoring the most reactionary measures, *i.e.*, W.P.A. cuts, Dies Committee, anti-alien legislation, etc., with the Republicans giving active support, though frequently behind the lines. For from their point of view, this is good strategy in preparing for a reactionary Republican victory in 1940, as well as for destroying the social gains of New Deal legislation now.

In approaching 1940, the camp of progress, especially we Communists, must show and convince the majority of the American people that definite progress can and must be made *now* to realize parts of this program, to secure the enactment of many of its features as the law of the land. At the same time, we must also point out that the full and consistent realization of the program of the democratic front requires the establishment of a democratic front government, of a progressive Congress with a strong labor representation and influence, relying upon and responsible to the people.

Similarly, we must help create greater clarity in our own ranks and among the broad masses regarding the political fact that each slogan and demand for recovery, jobs, democracy and peace is part of a general platform, of an integral and harmonious plan. And the central meaning and immediate purpose of this program is: the organization of a united democratic front mass movement and the establishment of a progressive, anti-fascist government of national and social security which will defeat the offensive of monopoly capital and block the road to fascism and war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAIN ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[*This is the fourth in Comrade Foster's series of articles. The next contribution, entitled "Secondary Aspects of Mass Organization," will appear in the July issue of* THE COMMUNIST.—*The Editors*]

THE present series of articles in *The Communist* is especially stressing the urgent need of the democratic front forces to adopt more effective methods of mass agitation, organization and struggle. This need exists because the fascists and reactionaries generally, with their insolent demagogy, ruthless discipline, airtight organization and policy of continuous attack, have rendered obsolete the customary hit-or-miss, loose methods now widely prevalent in democratic front organizations. Consequently, just as on the international scale disconnected peace-desiring countries cannot stem the war advance of the closely allied fascist powers, so, likewise, within the United States itself a loose majority of democratically-minded people is not strong enough to defeat the demoralizing mass activities of well-organized and ruthless reaction. Popular majorities in the United States, like the democratic countries of the world, must be firmly organized or be cut to pieces by the enemy. This is why organizational questions today take on a far more vital political significance than ever before.

Our Party, with its Marxist-Leninist training and the world experience of the Communist International to draw upon, has the task, as the vanguard of the proletariat, of helping energetically in drastically improving the organization methods of the masses.

At the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Zhdanov stated: "The distinguishing feature of our Party consists in the fact that at all stages of its revolutionary activity it has attached exceptional importance to organization." He also spoke of the need of "raising the organizational work to meet the demands of the political line." These statements apply with special force to the American democratic front movement. The future of our Party will depend in large measure upon the extent to which it understands this fact and leads in this necessary improvement of the mass organizations. The purpose of this article is to indicate in outline the main spheres of the organization work of the democratic front and the directions in which it needs strengthening.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. ORGANIZING THE MASS OFFENSIVE

The first group of organizational tasks of the democratic front constitute the general problem of intensifying the offensive of the people's democratic movement in support of its economic and political demands. This task is, of course, not simply organizational in character, but political work of the highest type, involving many questions of analysis, demands, timing, etc. It is the matter of sharpening up the struggle for democracy, peace, industrial recovery, equitable taxation, and all the other planks of the democratic front program.

The political situation is ripe for speeding up the present too slow tempo of mass struggle, first, because the workers, farmers and middle class elements are in a militant mood and ready actively to support the New Deal program; secondly, because the leaders of various key mass organizations, responsive to the militant mass moods, are willing to back up policies of progressive advance; and, thirdly, because the Roosevelt Administration, despite its many shortcomings, is liberal and disposed to make a defense of democracy, peace and the mass welfare. Besides, it is necessary that the masses go more actively over into the offensive because the employers, encouraged by their November election successes and the inability of the New Deal so far to overcome the economic crisis, are straining every nerve to develop a great offensive of their own to sweep the New Deal forces to defeat in 1940.

The offensive of the democratic front forces needs added stress, first, along the individual sectors—economic, trade union, peace, youth, etc. Thus, the struggle for the New Deal recovery program should be greatly sharpened; the fight for relief for the unemployed and the farmers also needs intensification; on the trade union front the work of organizing the unorganized should be stepped up; in the peace sector there is need to speed up the struggle to repeal the Neutrality Act and to mobilize the masses to support an active cooperation of the democratic powers to put a halt to Hitler's and Mussolini's war aggressions; among the youth the campaign for the right to jobs should be doubly invigorated, in the national groups the fight against fascist agitation must be increased, and so on along the several sectors of the mass struggle.

Secondly, these sectional advances on the various fronts must be integrated and intensified as a general offensive of the whole democratic front for the broad political program of the masses, to culminate in the coming national elections. The fate of the New Deal forces in 1940 depends upon the measure in which the democratic masses can develop this great election offensive.

In my article in last month's issue of *The Communist,* entitled "The Technique of the Mass Campaign," I dealt in detail with the principles of mass organization involved in developing and conducting offensives in special spheres and along all sectors jointly, and in my article in *The Communist* for February, entitled "New Methods of Political Mass Organization," I gave the specific organizational forms by which the democratic front as a whole can go forward most effectively.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These articles should be studied and the necessary conclusions drawn therefrom. There should also be more thorough analyses made of all the problems of the offensive. Fascists boast of their skill in using the offensive, but Communists should be far better masters than they of the key strategy of the advance.

2. CONSOLIDATING THE TOILERS' RANKS

The second group of urgent democratic front organizational tasks have to do with unifying the ranks of the various democratic mass organizations. The loose organizational forms and disconnected activities that we see all about us are a great handicap to developing the offensive of the people against reaction and also to every other phase of the mass struggle. The necessary work of tightening up the ranks of the people's forces is not only organizational but highly political.

Thus, the new C.I.O. unions confront the task of fully absorbing their armies of new members and of developing their new leaderships. Then there is the need to link the A. F. of L. craft unions more closely together by federations and amalgamations. But the greatest, all-decisive task in unifying the ranks of the trade unions is to re-establish unity between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., which is fundamentally the job of incorporating into the structure of organized labor generally the great progressive mass of newly-organized workers from the basic industries. The peace movement presents a similar urgent need for inner consolidation, as the present too loose groupings are developing only a fraction of their potential power. Between the trade unions and farmers' organizations there also exists a great need for closer relations and more consistent joint action, and every possibility to accomplish this increased solidarity must be explored.

Other democratic groups, such as the national groups and the great, predominantly proletarian, fraternal orders, need greater internal unity and more mutual connections. All the many tasks of unifying the people's forces against reaction converge in the general necessity of linking together the innumerable economic, political, cultural and social organizations of the workers, farmers, professionals, and small business elements into a broad democratic front in support of the New Deal program. This great central task involves a veritable maze of political-organizational considerations of the most decisive importance.

Our Party has dealt repeatedly with the various political and organizational aspects of this broad question of building the democratic front; in my article in *The Communist* for February, "New Methods of Political Mass Organization," I have tried to render concrete its organizational aspects. In this whole problem of consolidation, of unification, we Communists bear great responsibility. We are the most consistent advocates of centralization and united action, and hence, more than any others, we should be able to work effectively in unifying the toilers' ranks, whether in large or small degree; in every sector and on the whole front.

3 RECRUITING THE PEOPLE'S FORCES

As we have seen, the building of the democratic front and the specific

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preparations for victory in the 1940 elections imperatively demand that the masses begin to go over onto the offensive and that they draw together their at present too disconnected movements into more compact forms. It is no less urgent also that the respective mass organizations be greatly strengthened by systematic recruiting of their ranks.

In spite of all the organization work that has been done in recent years the great mass of the people still remain unorganized. The 8,000,000 trade unionists, for example, are only a fraction of the workers eligible to unions, and it is the same situation regarding farmers, youth, Negroes, women and professionals. The bulk are outside the organizations. In these days of increasing struggle this is a dangerous situation. The democratic front needs the added strength of these masses, and while they remain unorganized they are dangerously exposed to the demoralizing demagogy of the reactionaries. The intense class struggle of today demands imperatively that the very maximum possible of the masses be organized.

The political situation is favorable for the growth of all forms of democratic mass organization. The workers, farmers and other toilers, under the pressure of difficult economic conditions, have pretty clearly in mind demands to alleviate their grievances and they will readily organize and struggle. Considerable growth of mass organization is now taking place on various fronts. The A. F. of L. membership is expanding, the C.I.O. steel union has recently greatly increased its dues-paying membership, and other movements are also making progress. But the tempo of this growth is quite inadequate to the urgent needs and unusual opportunities of the political situation.

Many weaknesses in recruiting new members into the democratic mass organizations operate to slow down their growth; such as (a) sheer neglect to take advantage of the favorable opportunity to secure new members, (b) failure to utilize new methods (radio, movies, plays, etc.) in membership campaigns, (c) reliance upon local bodies for spontaneous recruiting activities, instead of mobilizing the whole organization for determined membership drives, (d) failure to connect up recruiting with the economic and political struggles of the mass organizations. Behind all these weaknesses lies an underestimation of the increased role of organization in today's struggle against reaction.

The matter of systematically recruiting to enhance the strength of the mass organizations is a political-organizational task of basic significance. It is also one of complexity. The mass organizations have rich experiences in this work, which should be made available to each other. But this is seldom done. In membership recruitment Communists especially should strive to be experts and the most active workers.

4. ADMINISTRATION OF MASS ORGANIZATIONS

The fourth general group of important organizational tasks in building the democratic front turns around the administration of the mass organizations. Good administration is vital to the development of the offensive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to all other phases of mass organization and struggle. Generally it is a field to which we have paid relatively little attention as yet, but one where the need for betterment in organizational practice is also urgent. Most mass organizations commonly use horse and buggy methods of management that would not be tolerated in employers' industrial organizations. Perhaps the worst offenders in this respect are the trade unions, especially the A. F. of L. craft unions.

There are glaring administrative evils and weaknesses in many of the people's mass organizations. In some there are bureaucracy, lack of democracy, excessive salaries for officials, extravagant financial systems, clique favoritism and nepotism. A common weakness is untrained and undisciplined organizing staffs and primitive systems of recruiting members. Other organizations neglect to attend to the special problems of Negroes, youth, women and national groups. Still others have stuffy official journals, dry-as-dust methods of mass agitation and absence of self-criticism. There is also much haphazard handling of workers' grievances, vest-pocket bookkeeping, and inadequate departmentalization. Such practices, most of which have their basis in political conservatism, should have no place in the toilers' ranks, as they enormously weaken the effectiveness of the mass organizations in every sphere of their activities.

It is a major responsibility of Communists to struggle against all these undermining influences in administration. Communists must be not only the best political analysts, program makers, mass agitators, organizers and active leaders in the daily struggles, but also the most expert administrators in the day-to-day work of mass organizations. To make ourselves properly efficient in these matters will require double effort, because the experience of the Left wing in this country has been in the field of mass agitation and struggle rather than in that of administration. It is only in recent years, with the great extension of mass organization into various fields, that Communists in considerable numbers are occupying important leading official positions and are being charged with administrative tasks. We must, therefore, pay far closer attention to the matter of the administration of mass organizations than we have done in the past. Articles should be written and studies made, carefully analyzing the many complex problems in this vital sphere of organizational practice.

DANGERS IN THE WORK

In all our democratic front political and organizational work—stimulating the offensive, consolidating, recruiting, administering the mass organizations, and every other phase—success is contingent upon constant vigilance and upon our doing a vast amount of mass political education to combat the ever-present dangers of Right opportunism and sectarianism, as well as outright wrecking activities by Trotskyites and other agents of reaction.

Characteristic Right opportunist tendencies in the mass organizations are class collaborationism, careerism among leaders, underestimation of political action, Jim Crowism, Red-baiting and the cultivation of capital-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist illusions. One harmful current variety of opportunism, which relates directly to the organizational theme of this article, is the common sluggishness of progressives in mobilizing the masses to support solidly their slogans. This happens time and again, in campaigns for peace, labor unity, labor legislation and other issues. Too much the sentiment prevails to "let Roosevelt and Lewis do it" by actions at the top, and too little the realization that even when the government administration and the trade union leadership favor certain measures it remains none the less necessary to counteract reactionary pressure and to put life into the people's demands by making a strong mobilization of the masses at the bottom to fight for them. This deficiency vastly reduces the power and achievements of the movement. In helping overcome such opportunist drifting tendencies, our Party has one of its biggest tasks.

Sectarianism shows itself among the mass organizations in various ways, among which are the parochial outlook of craft unionism, organizational particularism, the common trade union reluctance to develop close working relations with the farmers and professionals, isolationism on the peace question and general underestimation of the importance of international relations, neglect of the organization and demands of the youth, and many similar narrownesses. Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, under false flags of "radicalism," in their efforts to split and paralyze the people's movement, utilize Right opportunist and sectarian trends. Their recent attempt to split the Auto Workers Union emphasizes afresh the danger that they constitute.

The history of the American class struggle, like that of all other countries, is saturated with the evil effects of Right opportunist and sectarian tendencies, which check the growth of class consciousness among the workers, weaken their economic and political organizations, and undermine their struggles. The progress of the democratic front, therefore, will be measured by the extent to which such negative influences are overcome, by the degree to which class consciousness is developed among the masses and a more progressive leadership grows up in the struggle against opportunism in its various forms, both Right and "Left," and to root out all Trotskyite-Lovestoneite wrecking. Here again, the Communist Party bears a great responsibility. With its Marxist-Leninist training and in its capacity as vanguard of the proletariat, it especially must know how to fight effectively against all such destructive tendencies in the broad mass movement.

IN CONCLUSION

Comrade Browder has repeatedly warned us that the struggle to organize the masses into the democratic front is a race against time, that immediate, broad, vigorous and intelligent action by the toilers is necessary if they are to head off the rapidly coalescing forces of reaction. This is a fundamental truth that must never be lost sight of. For the democratic front to win this historic race against time, upon whose outcome the fate of the people depends, it is imperative, not only that the volume of its political-organizational work be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increased, but especially that the quality be improved. In this article I have given an outline of the general organizational tasks of the democratic front and the broad lines along which the betterments in form and method should go—indications which at least serve to point out the main jobs before us and to indicate our Party's responsibility in their fulfillment.

The broad masses of workers, farmers, professionals and small tradesmen in this country want to fight against fascism. Our Party, as the vanguard of the proletariat, must know how to utilize skillfully its Marxist-Leninist training to give the masses the good theoretical understanding, solid organization, and effective fighting tactics necessary for victory.

Despite all the croakers of the Norman Thomas variety who try to get the masses to throw up the sponge; despite all the treachery of the counter-revolutionary Trotsky-ite-Lovestoneites; despite the repeated sell-outs of the Chamberlains; despite the brutal assaults by the armed fascist powers—the democratic masses of the world are awakening politically, are consolidating their ranks and forging their way ahead in international struggle against the forces of reaction. The balance swings more and more to the side of the toiling masses fighting for peace, democracy and socialism, at whose head stands the mighty and invincible Soviet Union. In this growing world line-up of progressive forces the toilers of the United States are playing an increasingly important part. They are on the march and the times are auspicious for educating and solidly uniting them in vastly greater numbers. Improved methods of mass agitation, organization and struggle, which are indispensable to put into effect a sound political policy, are of fundamental importance in carrying out the historic role of their great democratic front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LENIN-STALIN TEACHING ON THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY

BY M. MITIN

Director of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

THE victory of socialism in the Soviet Union has blown to the winds the assertions of the learned lackeys of capitalism who have written piles of "scientific" works to prove that in general socialism is unthinkable and impossible. The victory of socialism, as embodied in the clearly-minted paragraphs of the Stalin Constitution, has thoroughly demolished the theoretical "prognoses" and cunning arguments of the reformists and opportunists who had never taken the socialist revolution and the victory of socialism seriously. The building of socialism in the Soviet Union has finally and completely discredited the treacherous ideas of Trotskyism and Bukharinism, ideas thoroughly inimical to the dictatorship of the working class, namely, that it was hopeless to think that socialism could triumph in the U.S.S.R.

Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution, his doctrine that under imperialism the victory of socialism is possible even in one country, taken separately, has been brilliantly confirmed in practice. Living reality has proved the truth of the Marxist-Leninist theory and the creative power of Marxism as developed in the works of Lenin and Stalin.

The doctrine that the victory of socialism is possible in one country constitutes a most important component of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. The basic principles of this theory Lenin worked out as far back as 1905, in his book *The Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,* in which he showed with masterly force that the working class must play the part of leader, must exercise the hegemony, in the forthcoming bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Countering the current Menshevik "theories" which denied the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry, Lenin developed the idea of an *alliance* between the proletariat and the peasantry in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the idea of an *alliance* between the proletariat and the other laboring and exploited masses in the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution.

Lenin thus struck a crushing blow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the old dogmatic notions of the Social-Democratic Parties.

A truly creative Marxist and brilliant adept in Marxist dialectics, Lenin made an all-around study of the specific conditions that prevailed in Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century. He proved how false was the traditional view of the leaders of the Second International that the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution were separated by a real gulf. Lenin's doctrine of the *hegemony of the proletariat* in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and his doctrine of its growing over into the *socialist* revolution are splendid examples of revolutionary dialectics.

Contrary to the Mensheviks, who denied that the role of the working class was one of action, initiative and leadership, Lenin set forth a militant program of action, worked out the basic tactics of the proletarian party, and drew a clear perspective of the struggle for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and for its further growth into the socialist revolution.

The value of these ideas is truly incalculable. Lenin enriched Marxism with a generalization of the new experience of the class struggle. His idea of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, the militant orientation he gave for the development of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism already contained all the basic elements from which the deduction could subsequently be drawn that the victory of socialism was possible in one country. This deduction was indeed drawn by Lenin later.

1. LENIN'S NEW THEORY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The truth that the victory of socialism was possible in one country was discovered by Lenin in 1915, at the height of the first imperialist World War, and formulated by him in the article "The United States of Europe Slogan," wherein he wrote:

> "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in several or even in one capitalist country, taken singly."

Lenin returned to this subject in the autumn of 1916, in his article "War Program of the Proletarian Revolution," wherein he said:

> "The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time."

Such was the conclusion Lenin arrived at from a study of the imperialist stage in the development of capitalism. This deduction is based on the law discovered by Lenin of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism. Lenin's doctrine of the *possibility* of the victory of socialism in one country taken singly, and of the *impossibility,* in the epoch of imperialism, of the simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all countries, meant that the old standpoint which prevailed among the Marxists

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on this question in the period of pre-imperialist capitalism was superseded by a new standpoint corresponding to the conditions of imperialism.

In the pre-imperialist epoch of capitalism, all Marxists, beginning with Marx and Engels, took the view that the victory of socialism in one country, taken singly, was impossible. They held that the victory of socialism demanded a simultaneous revolution in all countries. This view was expressed in its most direct and complete form by Engels in his *Principles of Communism* (1847), in which he said:

"Can this revolution take place in one country only? Answer: No . . . the communist revolution will not be merely a national revolution but will take place simultaneously in all civilized countries, that is, at least in England, America, France and Germany."

Writing to Engels in 1858, Marx declared that a socialist revolution in any one part of the European continent would be "inevitably crushed owing to the fact that the movement of bourgeois society is still on the upgrade in an incomparably wider territory."

As Comrade Stalin has repeatedly remarked, this fundamental standpoint *was correct* in the period of pre-imperialist development of capitalism. What was the characteristic feature of this period? Capitalism was *"still on the upgrade,"* the flourishing stage of its development was still in full swing. The globe had not yet been divided up between the capitalist states. They were still "peacefully" (without sharp clashes on a world-wide scale) seizing unoccupied territories, new colonies, markets and sources of raw material.

The unevenness of economic and political development was not yet so acute as in the succeeding period of imperialism. Under these circumstances, Engels' formula that the communist revolution must necessarily be simultaneous in all the decisive countries of the world was correct.

But the situation changed radically with the advent of the epoch of imperialism, at the beginning of the twentieth century, when, as Lenin says, the transition took place "from the old to the new capitalism."

In 1916 Lenin wrote his brilliant work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*—which is a direct continuation and development of Marx's *Capital.* Here Lenin gave a comprehensive scientific analysis and explanation of the economic and political phenomena disclosed by the new historical epoch.

Lenin's analysis of the new epoch in the development of the capitalist system, his discovery of the laws of the new period, the period of imperialism, are of great historical importance. Lenin appeared as a mighty innovator in social science. The heroes of the Second International, the lackeys of capitalism, the philistines, the traitors to the working class obsequiously predicted centuries of prosperity and success for capitalism. Lenin refuted such "theories," went counter to the current of Social-Democratic eulogies of capitalism, and showed that, in its imperialist stage, capitalism as a whole does not prosper, but declines, becomes *parasitic* and *decays,* that capitalism has already exhausted its historically progressive forces. In the epoch of imperialism, all the contradictions of the bourgeois system grow in extent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and depth to an extraordinary degree, and the elements for the revolutionary explosion of capitalism mature at a rapid rate.

Imperialism implies the rule of a financial oligarchy—of the magnates of finance capital—a huge growth of monopoly, a development of productive forces which is spasmodic to a hitherto unprecedented extent. The division of the world among the imperialist states is complete. The globe has become "too crowded" for imperialism. World economic development proceeds in the midst of a furious struggle between the chief imperialist states for foreign territories, for markets and for sources of raw material. Some countries move rapidly into the foreground, while others are pressed just as rapidly into the background. This development proceeds extremely unevenly and spasmodically, and by conflict.

One of Lenin's greatest discoveries in respect to the laws of the development of capitalism in its imperialist stage is the law of the *unevenness* of the economic and political development of capitalism. Uneven development was to be observed in the earlier epoch of industrial capitalism as well. But with the transition to imperialism, this unevenness acquires a *qualitatively* different expression. The change in quality consists in the fact that the more or less smooth evolutionary development of capitalism, a development not necessarily accompanied by military collisions on a world scale, gives place to an extremely rapid, spasmodic development of the capitalist states which is marked by great military conflicts embracing the whole world at a time when the globe has already been divided up and *capitalism as a whole is already on the downgrade.*

All this results in the extreme intensification and aggravation of the contradictions in the camp of imperialism, and in the weakening of imperialism, thereby necessitating a break in the chain of imperialism at its weakest link. Hence follows the impossibility of a simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all countries, and the possibility of the victory of socialism in a few countries, or even in one country taken separately.

Lenin was the first to make this fundamental discovery in social science, a discovery which has scrapped the old ideas that have become unsuitable in the new epoch of history. Strictly adhering to the method of Marx and to the whole spirit of the Marxian doctrine, and applying Marxism to the new and changed conditions, Lenin considerably advanced Marxist theory.

Comrade Stalin has said that it was Lenin's greatness as a continuer of the work of Marx and Engels that he was never a slave to the letter of Marxism. Lenin strictly observed Marx's and Engels' instructions that Marxism must not be regarded as a petrified dogma, but as a guide to action.

It is a mark of Lenin's greatness that he frankly, honestly and unhesitatingly faced the necessity of revising the old formula of socialist revolution and replacing it by a new formula, namely, that the victory of socialism is possible in individual countries.

Lenin's discovery has placed a tren-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chant weapon in the hands of the working class; it has opened up before it brilliant revolutionary prospects; it has unfettered the initiative of the proletariat of the individual countries for the assault on their own bourgeoisie; it has strengthened the faith of the working class in future victory. It is not strange therefore that all the enemies of Marxism and traitors to the cause of the working class—Mensheviks, Kautskians and Trotskyites—attacked Lenin's doctrine with such fury.

In 1915, that veteran Menshevik and despicable falsifier of Marxism, that Judas, Trotsky, hastened to declare war on Lenin's position that the victory of socialism was possible in one country.

"What would have happened to the Party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin had been overawed by the letter of Marxism and had not had the courage of theoretical conviction to discard one of the old conclusions of Marxism and to replace it by a new conclusion affirming that the victory of socialism in one country, taken singly, was possible, a conclusion which corresponded to the new historical conditions? The Party would have groped in the dark, the proletarian revolution would have been deprived of leadership, and the Marxist theory would have begun to decay. The proletariat would have lost, and the enemies of the proletariat would have won." *

As the decision of the Central Committee on the organization of Party propaganda—in connection with the publication of the *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)*—points out, Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution has latterly been vulgarized and distorted in our propaganda work. The fact that under imperialism the victory of socialism in one country is possible was stressed, but what Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly pointed out, namely, that owing to the law of uneven development the *simultaneous* victory of the socialist revolution in all countries is impossible—was left out of consideration. The profound significance of such a statement of the question lies in the fact that it sharply emphasizes the *full difference* between the new formula of socialist revolution discovered by Lenin and the old formula adhered to by Marxists in the epoch of industrial capitalism.

Lenin's standpoint, which formulates with the utmost directness and clarity the principle that in the epoch of imperialism the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries is *impossible,* mobilizes the working class of each individual country for the revolutionary struggle against its own bourgeoisie, and stimulates revolutionary energy to break the chain of imperialism at its weakest links. The two sides of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution must be taken *conjointly and inseparably.* For it is in conjunction that they present an integral and complete idea of Lenin's new theory of the socialist revolution.

2. THE PROFOUND ORGANIZING, MOBILIZING AND TRANSFORMING VALUE OF LENIN'S THEORY

Lenin's discovery regarding the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country is truly of epoch-making importance for the whole development of human society.

It was on the basis of this theory

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, p. 357, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Lenin in 1917, in his brilliant April Theses, outlined a detailed militant plan of transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second—a plan of transition to the socialist revolution.

It was on the basis of this theory that Comrade Stalin, at the Sixth Party Congress, proclaimed that "Russia will be the country that will lay the road to socialism."

It was with this theory on its banner that the working class of our country stormed the stronghold of capitalism in the battle days of October, 1917.

The Bolshevik Party was the only party which considered the victory of socialism in Russia possible and which had a clear and definite program of struggle for this victory. Only with such a clear program was it possible to lead the working class and the laboring masses as a whole in the fight against capitalism. Why, indeed, should the working people fight for the revolution if they thought that the building of socialism in our country was hopeless and doomed to failure should the proletarian revolution in other countries be delayed?

After October, 1917, Lenin and Stalin repeatedly reverted to the question of the victory of socialism in our country. In 1919, in an article entitled "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," Lenin said that in our country, where the dictatorship of the proletariat prevailed, from the economic standpoint the victory of communism was fully guaranteed. In 1921, in his well-known pamphlet, *The Food Tax*, he showed that in all respects we were able, and should, lay the foundation of a socialist economic system. In 1923, in his article "On Cooperation," he wrote that in our country "every essential exists for the building of a complete socialist society."

In October, 1920, speaking in Vladikavkaz at a conference of Communist organizations of the Don and the Caucasus, Comrade Stalin denounced Trotsky's counter-revolutionary ideas, and said: "It turns out that not only can a socialist revolution begin in a backward country, but it can even be crowned with success, march forward, and serve as an example for capitalistically developed countries."

Lenin and Stalin organized all the strength, will and might of the working class for the struggle, and inspired the working people of the Soviet country with the great purpose of building a socialist society, a life of joy and happiness for the people.

Lenin's theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country was a tremendous force which inspired the workers and peasants to give battle to the landlords and capitalists, to the White Guards and the foreign forces of intervention, and to fight for the victory of socialism. The Soviet Republic had to endure many trials and hardships. The defeated Russian landlords and capitalists negotiated with the capitalists of other countries the organization of military intervention against the land of Soviets with the object of crushing the working class and the Communist Party, restoring capitalism in Russia, and delivering over our country to enslavement and dismemberment by the foreign bourgeoisie. The Bolshevik Party roused:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

". . . the workers and peasants for a war *for the fatherland,* a war against the foreign invaders and the bourgeois and landlord White Guards." *

Fired by a clear purpose—the victory of socialism—the Soviet power defeated the hordes of the invaders and White Guards in civil war, the war for the fatherland, and restored the shattered economic life of the country.

With Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution as our banner, and under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, who is carrying on the work of Lenin, we accomplished the great plan for the industrialization of our country and the collectivization of agriculture. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., the most democratic constitution in the world, is the legislative embodiment of the victory of the socialist system in the U.S.S.R.

3. STALIN'S DEVELOPMENT OF LENIN'S THEORY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The question whether the victory of socialism was possible in the Soviet Union became particularly urgent and acute after Lenin's death, towards the end of the restoration period, in 1925. What was the situation at home and abroad at that time? Thanks to the wise policy of the Bolshevik Party, the Soviet Republic had secured a fairly long respite and had restored the economic life of the country with the aid of the New Economic Policy. In other countries the proletarian revolution had obviously been delayed. Capitalism had entered on a period of temporary and relative stabilization. This temporary and partial stabilization of capitalism was fraught with a new growth and intensification of contradictions which revealed the utter rottenness of the capitalist system and the inevitability of a new rise of revolution.

The U.S.S.R., the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, was also passing through its period of stabilization. But our stabilization was fundamentally different from that of capitalism. It testified to the steady increase in the political and economic might of the Soviet Union.

But this raised the question in all its urgency—what was to be the destiny of socialism in the U.S.S.R.? In what direction was our country to develop—towards socialism or towards capitalism? As the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* states, the question stood as follows:

"Should we and could we build a socialist economic system; or were we fated but to manure the soil for another economic system, the capitalist economic system? Was it possible at all to build a socialist economic system in the U.S.S.R., and, if so, could it be built in spite of the delay of the revolution in the capitalist countries, in spite of the stabilization of capitalism? Was it possible to build a socialist economic system by way of the New Economic Policy, which, while it was strengthening and augmenting the forces of socialism in the country in every way, nevertheless still promoted a certain growth of capitalism?" *

Following the behests of Lenin, our Bolshevik Party gave the only possible and only correct answer to these questions. It said that the U.S.S.R. had everything essential for the building of a complete socialist

* *Ibid.*, p. 247.

* *Ibid.*, p. 272.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society, that we would build it and that the victory would be ours!

Thereupon, all the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship, enemies of the people and traitors to socialism, rose up against the Party. Wearing a false mask of "orthodoxy," juggling with quotations mechanically plucked from the works of Marx and Engels, pretending to be opposed to what they called "national narrow-mindedness," those vile and despicable foes of Marxism-Leninism, the Trotskyite and Zinovievite traitors, tried to emasculate, mutilate and nullify Lenin's doctrine regarding the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country. They wanted to destroy the gains of the great October Socialist Revolution, to turn back the wheel of history, to place the country on the road to the restoration of capitalism.

If, in face of the resistance of the enemies, we were to fulfil Lenin's behests—to get rid of our technical and economic backwardness and build up a socialist economic system—we had to mobilize the revolutionary will of the workers and peasants of our country and throw all our forces into the struggle for the victory of socialist construction. And if the scales of history have turned in our favor, a tremendous mobilizing and organizing factor in this was the Lenin-Stalin doctrine that it was possible to build socialism in our country.

With exceptional force and courage, with classical profundity and precision, Comrade Stalin exposed the machinations of the foes of Marxism-Leninism and, constructively developing Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution, offered battle to Trotskyism along the whole front.

In a number of writings—"The Results of the Fourteenth Conference of the Russian Communist Party"; "The Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party"; "Once More Regarding the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party"—Comrade Stalin *raised Lenin's doctrine regarding the victory of socialism in one country to a new and higher level;* he enriched and developed it by working out the import of this cardinal problem of Marxism-Leninism in the period of decisive battles between socialism and capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

In 1925, speaking at the Thirteenth Moscow Provincial Conference of the Party, Comrade Stalin said that Trotskyism:

> ". . . endeavors to inculcate disbelief in the strength of our revolution, in the alliance of the workers and peasants, in the transformation of N.E.P. Russia into a socialist Russia. Therefore, unless Trotskyism is defeated, it will be impossible to achieve victory under the conditions of the New Economic Policy, it will be impossible to convert present-day Russia into a socialist Russia."

Exposing the falsity of the Trotskyites' assertion that the unevenness of development was greater before imperialism, Comrade Stalin demonstrated the dialectics of development in the epoch of imperialism. The difference between the levels of development of the bourgeois states *diminishes,* the backward countries speed up their development and catch up with the foremost countries, the *leveling-up process becomes more marked,* yet at the same time, the unevenness of economic and political development of capitalism becomes tremendous.

Substantiating and developing Len-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in's theory of the socialist revolution, Comrade Stalin has repeatedly pointed out that a distinction must be made between two aspects of the question whether the victory of socialism in one country is possible—the domestic aspect and the international aspect.

The domestic aspect of the question was determined by the following considerations: Did the conditions exist within our country which would enable us to overcome its technical and economic backwardness and to build socialism? Were there the forces within our country that could vanquish the elements of capitalism and remove such contradictions as existed between the working class and the peasantry? Could the greater mass of the peasantry be drawn into the work of socialist construction? Was the working class of our country able to lead the greater mass of the peasantry along the road of socialist construction?

Led by Comrade Stalin, and adhering fully and completely to Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, our Party answered: Yes, the working class would guide and lead the peasantry to socialism, to a prosperous, joyous and happy life. The Party declared that there was a basis permitting the removal of such contradictions as existed between the working class and the peasantry—for, after all, the working class and peasantry had *fundamental interests in common.* The Party affirmed that we could most certainly overcome our technical and economic backwardness and build up socialism, drawing strength from within the country, from the workers and peasants.

The Party declared that if we followed Lenin's policy, if we kept on strengthening the alliance between the working class and the greater mass of the peasantry, with the working class as the leader, and if we gave short shrift to sceptics, malcontents and traitors, we would most certainly win and socialism would triumph in our country.

But there was another aspect to the question of the victory of socialism in one country, the *international* aspect. This concerned the relations of the country of socialism with the encircling capitalist world. As long as the capitalist encirclement existed, the Party declared, there was a danger of intervention by capitalist countries and, consequently, a danger that the old bourgeois system might be restored.

The first set of contradictions must not be confused with the second, the domestic aspect of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country with the international aspect. While within the country there exist all the conditions and requisites for the achievement of a complete socialist society, the final victory of socialism in our country depends on the collapse of the capitalist encirclement. As long as the capitalist encirclement exists, as long as the U.S.S.R. is an island in the midst of a sea of capitalist states, we cannot regard the victory of socialism in our country as final.

Replying very recently to the letter of Comrade Ivanov, the Young Communist Leaguer, Comrade Stalin once more elucidated the basic points of the doctrine that the victory of socialism in our country is possible. As

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comrade Ivanov's letter shows, the utterly false opinion had become widely current in our country that we had already attained the final victory of socialism and a complete guarantee against intervention and the restoration of capitalism.

This idea is a direct falsification of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of the victory of socialism in one country, a direct departure from the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory. Such an opinion testifies to a thorough lack of understanding of actual realities and is nothing but the empty boasting of swell-headed officials. Such ideas are extremely harmful, inimical to socialism, and are only calculated to demobilize us in face of the danger offered by the capitalist encirclement. In his reply to Comrade Ivanov, Comrade Stalin said:

"Only blockheads or masked enemies, who by their boastfulness want to conceal their hostility and are striving to demobilize the people, can deny the danger of military intervention and of attempts of restoration as long as the capitalist encirclement exists. Can the victory of socialism in one country be regarded as final if this country is encircled by capitalism, and if it is not fully guaranteed against the danger of intervention and restoration? Clearly it cannot."*

Analyzing (in 1922) the position of the Soviet Republic in the midst of capitalist states, in view of the fundamental antithesis between the capitalist and socialist systems, Lenin said that a collision between the two worlds was bound to come:

". . . We are surrounded by people, classes, governments, which openly proclaim their deepest hatred for us. We must bear in mind that we shall always be but a hair's breadth from new invasion."

Our achievements, every new advance made by the country of socialism, only infuriate our enemies still more and intensify their hatred of the U.S.S.R. The bourgeoisie understands perfectly well that the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. means the beginning of the end of capitalism all over the world. The capitalist countries, especially the fascist aggressors, are actively preparing for war on the U.S.S.R., are dreaming of intervention with the object of forcibly restoring capitalism in our country. Obviously we must keep ourselves fully mobilized and in fighting readiness in face of the capitalist encirclement, we must strengthen to the utmost our Red Army and our Soviet intelligence service, and ruthlessly ferret out and destroy the diversionists, spies, terrorists and fascist agents who are trying to strike at the country of socialism from the rear.

However, the complete destruction of the capitalist encirclement, the complete removal of all danger of intervention, and, consequently, the complete victory of socialism in our country can be brought about "only by combining the serious efforts of the international proletariat with the still more serious efforts of the whole of our Soviet people." (Stalin.)

The working people of the U.S.S.R. know that it is not only due to their own efforts that they have achieved the victory of socialism, but also to the support of the international proletariat. The U.S.S.R. is the child of the world proletariat. The international ties of the working class of the U.S.S.R. with the workers of capi-

* Joseph Stalin, *A Letter to Ivanov*, p. 12, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talist countries, the fraternal alliance of the toiling people of the U.S.S.R. with the toiling people of the world, constitute one of the conditions of the might of the Soviet state. The war which the Soviet people will wage against the fascist aggressors, should the latter attack the U.S.S.R., will be the most just of wars, and it will earn for us the greatest sympathy throughout the civilized world, and the revolutionary solidarity of the workers and oppressed of all countries.

* * *

Such is the epoch-making significance of Lenin's masterly doctrine regarding the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. Comrade Stalin defended this doctrine in battle against the Trotskyite and Bukharinite scum, raised it to a new and higher level, and put it into practice. It is with full justification that we now speak of the *Leninist-Stalinist theory of socialist revolution*. Without the works of Comrade Stalin, one cannot grasp the profundity of Lenin's theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. The vast theoretical material and rich practical revolutionary experience, so brilliantly generalized and developed in the works of Comrade Stalin, are for us a guiding star in the further progress of our country towards communism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CURRENT TRENDS IN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGY

BY R. L. GLEY

AT THE annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, which was held at Columbus, Ohio, in September, 1938 (one month before Munich), the members wore celluloid badges instead of the silk badges that had been worn at previous meetings. The luncheon for Spain repeated the success of the one given the previous year. In two actions, the business meeting of the Association took notice of the attacks of fascism on psychology. A Committee on Displaced Foreign Psychologists was set up to assist refugees from fascist countries—a step which shows very strong sympathy, since jobs for refugees mean, in a short-sighted view, jobs taken away from Americans.*

The other action, which was even more significant, was the passage by acclamation of a resolution that the Twelfth International Congress of Psychology, which had been scheduled for Vienna in 1941, be transferred to "some other country where the progress of psychology as a branch of science is not hindered by a government hostile to the tradition of free and unimpeded scholarship." Similar resolutions had already been passed at the meetings of many regional and special organizations, including the Midwestern Psychological Association, which had the honor of initiating the movement, the Chicago Psychological Club, the Western Psychological Association, the Illinois Society for Consulting Psychologists, the Rocky Mountain Branch of the A.P.A., the Psychologists League of New York City, the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues, and the American Association of Applied Psychology. A very mildly worded resolution presented to the Psychometric Society had been "tabled."

For the psychological profession as a whole, these events represent a huge step forward in progressive expression. Of course, they did not come without preparation, nor without effort on the part of those most aware of their importance. We may trace quickly the main steps in organizational expression of the progressive trend in American psychology. The apparent hopelessness, a few years ago, of stirring any of the

* The contributions of European psychologists have always played an important part in the development of American psychology. The hospitality extended to them will be well repaid, because the interest they arouse will cause expansion which will provide positions for many more Americans.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

established professional organizations into anything like action led to the formation, in New York City, of the Psychologists' League. Its membership consisted mostly of the younger members of the profession, many of whom were unemployed. The older organizations failed to express the desires and views of this younger group, because they granted voting privileges only to "full members."* The League succeeded in drawing attention both to the need for serious consideration of the economic problems of the profession (the evil of "volunteer" work, unemployment, lack of adequate psychological services in the schools and elsewhere, etc.), and to the need for more social orientation of research.

When the A.P.A. met at Dartmouth in 1936, pressure on the part of the rank-and-file membership led to a decision that the national association would join with the Psychologists' League in a proposed Joint Committee on Employment of Psychologists, to which the Association of Consulting Psychologists also soon adhered.

At the Dartmouth meeting, also, steps were taken toward organization of the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues. The purpose of this new organization was not only to encourage psychological research on important social problems, but also to help protect the authors of such research in their positions and to help publicize results "which seemed socially significant."

* The higher category of membership is open only to those who have published research beyond the doctorate, and it involves the payment of higher annual dues.

The response was so great that at the time of the first formal meeting of the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues, at Minneapolis in 1937, there were already several hundred members. Meanwhile, a Psychologists' Committee of the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy had been formed, bringing together a surprisingly large number of outstanding figures in American psychology. The luncheon for Spain was easily the outstanding event of the Minneapolis meeting, and attendance at the regular sessions was remarkably decreased during the showing of the film *Heart of Spain*.

This progressive trend, leading up to the anti-fascist resolution recommending that no congress should be held in Nazidom, has quite naturally been associated with changes in the character of the research and theoretical speculation in which psychologists have engaged. To understand these changes, we must review the development of American psychology since the period of the World War.

THE ACADEMIC TRADITION

In the pre-war period, two opposing trends fought for supremacy. One was the dualistic, mentalistic psychology of the established academic tradition, which took as its task the description of consciousness. Let us briefly outline the complex social forces which had determined the character of this psychology:

(a) The main lines of its theory (association of ideas, pleasure-pain motivation, etc.), were a social heritage from the day when the materialistic spokesmen of the rising bourgeois

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class laid down the foundations of modern psychology in the treatises on "human nature" with which they introduced their arguments about the proper and necessary forms of society.

(b) It had not escaped at all from the principal limitation of that early psychology, the failure to understand that individuals were more than isolated atoms influencing one another like so many beans in a social beanbag—a limitation which was rooted in the capitalist view of society as made up of competing individuals.

(c) Its major advance, that it had become an experimental science, was due to the indirect influence of the growth of industry, exerted through other sciences which had developed strongly during the nineteenth century, especially physiology.

(d) Finally, its extreme preoccupation with the internal processes of thinking, treated in isolation from behavior, was an expression of the social position of the academic university professor—theory at its furthest remove from practice—and was possible only because during the latter part of the nineteenth century psychology had lost all contact with the practical demands of society.

THE PERIOD OF BEHAVIORISM

The opposing tendency had its basis in the new demands which were being placed on psychology by the new phase of capitalist development, and which were felt more strongly in the United States than anywhere else. The growth of public education, in consequence of industrial needs, led to intelligence tests (first introduced in France, but rapidly developed here). The demand for efficiency led to the application of motor tests and other selective tests in industry (Münsterberg).

Just before the war, John B. Watson was beginning to outline the position of behaviorism, or mechanical materialism in psychology, as the most rebellious statement of the opposition to the academic psychology which confined itself to the study of thinking. This debate was lifted out of the realm of theory, and settled very quickly in practice by the imperious demands of capitalism in its greatest crisis—war. What might have continued through decades as an academic debate was accomplished in months. The first issue of the *Journal of Applied Psychology* appeared almost simultaneously with the entrance of the United States into the war. When the "Experimentalists," who represented the most subjective tendency in psychology, unanimously offered their services to the government, they closed a chapter in the history of psychology.

For the next year and a half, the question of "pure" science or applied science was very effectively settled, by the generosity with which the government distributed officers' commissions to psychologists. Unfortunately, certain important theoretical questions were settled quite as abruptly, by surrender to the demands of the ruling class. In particular, the army test data were interpreted as pointing to the mental "inferiority" of the Negro people, and to the "inferiority" of farmers and workers compared with business people and professionals. These "discoveries" resulted from a failure to distinguish between the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

level of achievement which the "tests" disclosed (and which was reached under the most unequal environmental conditions) and the level of native capacity, of which they could give no indication whatever.

Psychologists left their war-time service with a feeling that they had proved their value in the world of affairs. They expected that it would be possible for them to enter well-paid positions in industry, where they would continue similar lines of work. However, these hopes were doomed to disappointment, for the number of psychologists who secured gainful employment in industry never numbered more than a few score. (The results of psychological research have been used in personnel departments; but it is only rarely that a psychologist is employed to direct this work.)

This disappointing reality might have encouraged a revival of the old intellectualistic psychology, if the life of the universities themselves had not undergone a great change. But the universities were seized by a wave of expansion—one of the minor consequences of America's new position as the world's leading power, which would have to send its sons to every corner of the globe to keep an eye on its investments. The student enrollment grew in departments of psychology as in every department, and grew so rapidly that there was a steady demand for new teachers of the subject. The number of psychologists increased sharply; but the teaching of psychology continued to be almost their only source of livelihood.

This period of swift expansion, when all the bright young men swiftly won good positions, was one during which bold new hypotheses were encouraged by objective conditions. This was no time when a handful of oldtimers, who had studied at Leipzig and grown beards like Wundt's, could continue to direct the course of psychology's development. Even a bit of radicalism could be tolerated, and here and there the young behaviorists dared to hint at anti-traditionalistic, even anti-religious implications of their materialistic theories.

During this period, the hegemony in construction of psychological theory was held quite definitely by investigations of motor behavior. A consistent effort was made to reduce all behavior to the functioning of habit, and particularly to the physiological mechanism of the conditioned reflex. There was a theoretical, rather than a practical, interest in the application of the results to human problems; for, although the attitudes of psychologists reflected the pressure of the busy American scene, they did not succeed in throwing off their old academicism.

The behaviorists occasionally hinted at a new social order which would follow the application of their impending discoveries.* They seemed to assume that they could develop all the laws of society from experiments

* "If the assumption that a rigid mechanism may underlie human behavior and human achievement has a probability sufficiently high to receive scientific recognition, then in the formulation of the future program of social control there will be a reaction against some of the norms which have been developed under a traditional and non-scientific ethics. . . . These assumptions present potentialities in the development of human behavior before which the best in past or present ethics and esthetics pales into utter insignificance." (A. P. Weiss, *A Theoretical Basis of Human Behavior*, 1925, p. 439f.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with white rats, without examining man in his social and class environment.

Social psychology was in its infancy. Floyd Allport's *Social Psychology* (1926) was, in a sense, the height of the behaviorist movement, since it was the broadest attempt to meet the problems of explaining all of behavior on the strict physiological principles of the conditioned response. But it dealt only with an isolated individual, responding to certain special types of stimuli, such as language. For Allport, for Watson, and for American psychologists as a whole, the business of social psychology was to study the way in which "society" imposed certain habits of behavior on the plastic individual. No consideration at all was given to group action, or to its basic sources in economic and political factors. Social conflict appeared only as the abnormal behavior of individuals who, through some psychopathology, opposed the social norm.

The tone of this psychology was one of aggressive but vulgar materialism. Its emphasis on the physiological mechanism of behavior was a blow at idealism; but its progressive possibilities were thwarted by its static, mechanistic features. It represented an assertion that behavior is material in its whole determination; but the form of this assertion was one which limited it still to the study of isolated individuals, seen outside of their historical, socio-economic settings. It could not give a materialistic approach to *all* the aspects of behavior, including the higher forms of thinking and the social forms of motivation. It swept the idealistic concept of "instinct" out of psychology; but it did not know how to supply any materialistic substitute. Repeatedly, the principal exponents of behaviorism defined their materialism in the terms of strict mechanism. Watson's early pronouncement remained in force:

> "Our science does not feel the need of changing its methods and principles in passing from simple forms of behavior to more complex ones. . . . No new principle is needed in passing from the unicellular organisms to man." *

This refusal of the behaviorists, on principle, to recognize any qualitative differences in levels of behavior prevented them from dealing successfully with the problems of social psychology.

IMPACT OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The economic crisis changed completely the conditions under which American psychologists had been working. Expansion stopped immediately, and "retrenchment" followed soon after. Promotions stopped, and there was a surplus of candidates for the lowest positions. In most universities, there were wage cuts. Professors looked around to see if there were still a few little openings here and there in industry, but these also disappeared. Even the measure of academic freedom which had existed was threatened, and in many cases destroyed. The mild radicalism of the post-War, pre-crisis period was no longer smiled upon, and the "necessities of retrenchment" made it easy for boards of trustees to enforce discipline. Slashes in research budgets

* *Behavior*, 1914, p. 317f

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made many a psychologist, whose horizon had not extended beyond his laboratory, suddenly wonder about the potency of scientific experiments alone to change the world. In many ways, the economic crisis exerted a restrictive influence on the universities, which, in turn, held back the development of psychology.

One effect of this new situation was, of course, to encourage the flourishing of reactionary tendencies in psychology. Every sort of mystical tendency could count on applause from those who were fearful for the preservation of their class privileges. A premium was placed on unfounded generalizations in the fields of social and political psychology, which could be used to provide a "scientific basis" for social injustices and the continuance of things as they were. It would not be difficult to draw up a dishonor list of psychologists who sacrificed the integrity of their science in an effort to cash in on this premium. In these ways, capitalism exerted its inevitable coercion upon psychologists, to compel them to remain its servants.

However, there were also certain forward-moving trends whose development was initiated or hastened by the economic crisis, and it is in these that we are especially interested. The general radicalization in the country had its effect also in academic circles. A large part of the psychological research of any year is the work of the graduate students; and many of the latter, who were in much closer touch than their professors with the outside world, were torn between the desire to do something *real* for a real world, and something *safe*, which might be a good recommendation for placement. The young instructors, fearful of their tenuously held positions, faced the same dilemma.

This opposition of the *real* problem, as something which emerges from the life of our times, and the academic problem (which has its class roots, though not always obviously) is one of the principal forms which the struggle of materialism against idealism has assumed. This struggle has gone beyond the old opposition between objective methods and introspection. True materialism today requires more than an insistence upon objectively measurable observations. It requires a willingness to descend from an ivory-tower laboratory to grapple with earthly, materialistic, social problems, even if the data gathered in this way do not lend themselves to the same type of precise measurement as the data of the natural sciences. Materialism today means escaping the "abstract human being" and dealing with concrete human beings of the present, each an "ensemble of social relations" (Marx).

INTELLIGENCE AND SOCIETY

The field of intelligence testing is one in which it is particularly easy to recognize how theoretical and practical advances are linked up with a progressive social attitude. American psychologists used to interpret the results of their research in this field along the lines of capitalist apologetics and racial prejudice, even though in most cases they were not aware of the reactionary motivating forces.

As a result, the chauvinistic theory

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of "Negro inferiority" and the theory that the class structure of society is based on a natural hierarchy of intelligence were widely accepted as "scientific facts." During recent years, the fallacies that lie behind such interpretations have been exposed.* For example, Klineberg has shown that the intelligence scores of Negro children who have come to New York City from the South rise, and that the amount of rise depends on the length of residence in this relatively more favorable environment.

Wellman's studies, in Iowa, have shown a striking increase in the intelligence of young children when they are given the advantages of good nursery school education, and a decline in the intelligence of children placed in institutions that do not give them proper advantages. Psychologists have just begun to pay attention to the obvious importance of adequate food for proper intellectual development. Research such as this is not simply a natural development in the field of psychology; it is the outgrowth of new viewpoints that have penetrated psychology from outside.

Psychologists were never able to see the true problems involved until their eyes were opened by the fight of the working class against exploitation, and the fight of the Negro people against discrimination. The old facts were open to the same sort of dynamic interpretation; but it was necessary for the injustices of our society to be challenged on the political plane before psychologists could free themselves from the corresponding prejudices on the scientific plane.

The new results are also compelling psychologists to re-examine the very theory of intelligence, and there are beginnings of an approach to a social concept of intelligence, in which there will be some recognition of the fact that the nature of the characteristic which we designate and measure as intelligence depends basically on the nature of the society itself, with the different demands that it places on the individual.

Of course, it cannot be said as yet that these new viewpoints in the field of intelligence testing have already displaced the older ones. In a national referendum of psychologists, it is likely that the "constancy of the I.Q."* would still be upheld by a majority vote. But the trend of development is definitely in the direction we have indicated and, what is important for our problem, the fundamental theoretical questions involved will undoubtedly be fought out in the field of social research—and action.

* For a summary of work in this field, see W. S. Neff, "Socioeconomic Status and Intelligence," in the *Psychological Bulletin*, December, 1938.

* The I.Q., or intelligence quotient, is a measure of the degree to which the intellectual achievement of the individual rises above or falls below the "average" for his age. (The achievement of an adult is compared with that of the average person of about sixteen years of age, when the intelligence of the average individual is supposed to stop increasing. This point is sometimes fixed higher or lower than sixteen.) It used to be generally believed that the I.Q. remains constant from early childhood to maturity. This would imply that a child who is backward in early childhood will always remain backward. Inconstancy of the I.Q., supported by evidence of the type cited above, means that the relative position of one individual to others of his own age changes as a result of environmental influences. It also opens the possibility that the general average intelligence will be raised considerably by social environment—as is being demonstrated today in the socialist society of the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESEARCH WITHOUT OPINIONS

Elsewhere, the relation between new viewpoints and socially progressive orientation may be less obvious; but it is just as real. Sometimes this relation is obscured by the fact that investigators are so anxious to avoid the charge of "bias" that they stop far short of drawing the full conclusions indicated by their research. However, this timidity really permits capitalist class pressure to limit the development of science, whose discoveries should be a guide to fearless conclusions.

The field of attitude study is one whose development has undoubtedly been hampered in this way. Psychologists working in this field have confined their efforts to attempts to *measure* attitudes. They invariably assume that all the attitudes relative to a given question can be arrayed between two extremes on a linear scale, so that any particular attitude is defined by its position on this scale. This assumption overlooks the important qualitative distinctions which must be made. Sometimes points which lie far apart on a scale of this kind may have more in common than other points which lie closer together. For example, extreme pacifism and extreme chauvinism, on a scale of attitudes toward "militarism," can lead into a political alliance of isolationists, as in the present world situation.

Qualitative analysis of attitudes must take into account the history of these attitudes, and their relation to political alignments. The reluctance of psychologists to deal with these matters, and to make any judgments about the relative merits of different attitudes, is the principal reason why they do not go beyond "measuring" attitudes.

Almost every published study of "radicalism" suffers from the lack of any consistent political definition of radicalism. The lack does not arise from the difficulty of the problem, but from the unwillingness of the authors to risk seeming "partisan." Work in this field will continue to be inconclusive and merely descriptive until psychologists are prepared to make use of definitions which have a direct political relevance. Till then, they will go on mixing incompatible forms of "radicalism" in a common stew. Most psychologists are still prone to class under "radicalism" all kinds of political, religious and moral nonconformity. If psychologists do not evaluate attitudes objectively, they will not be able to understand the role that attitudes play in personality structure.

It will be easier to arrive at sound scientific conclusions when psychologists adopt starting-points that are frankly progressive and anti-fascist. That is why such an action as the one that we mentioned at the beginning of our article, the resolution of the A.P.A. against meeting in Vienna, raises such hopes for the immediate future of American psychology.

The yearbooks which are planned by the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues, on "The Psychology of Industrial Conflict" and "The Psychology of International Conflict," can exert tremendous influence if they will fearlessly adopt a progressive position as the basis of their scientific

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysis.* For, it is not only true that science leads to progress, and that reaction is the enemy of science, but also that a progressive standpoint is the foundation for scientific work.

Closely related to attitude study is the field of propaganda. The student of propaganda techniques is compelled to recognize a fact which psychologists who have been approaching attitudes as an aspect of personality have too often ignored—that attitudes are not permanent, but subject to change. The importance of a sound analysis of the political context in which the propaganda is functioning can be shown by the example of Hartmann's study of the effectiveness of "immediate" and "remote" goals as leaflet appeals in a political campaign.** He made this study in connection with the Socialist Party campaign in Altoona, Pa., in the Presidential election of 1936. Two types of leaflets were distributed, in different sections of the city.

The experiment failed, Hartmann ruefully admits, due to the "practical obliteration" of the Norman Thomas vote, which declined from 569 in 1932 to 75 in 1936. Nevertheless, he sees in the shift of former Socialist voters to the New Deal standard a demonstration that immediate goals are more effective, and he goes on to mourn that "at every election, a vast army of Esaus sell their birthright for a mess of pottage." In criticism of this study and its conclusions, we must take the following facts into account: (a) the appeal of the Socialist Party for votes to satisfy "immediate" needs was a fraud, because sincerity would have demanded recognition of the fact that the broadest popular unity around the New Deal platform was needed to prevent reaction from ignoring the people's immediate emergency needs; (b) the appeal for Socialist Party votes to help attain "remote" goals was demagogy, because, as Earl Browder pointed out, the issue of the election was not one of "socialism or capitalism," but democracy or fascism; (c) the declaration that those former Thomas supporters who switched to Roosevelt were "selling their birthright for a mess of pottage," overlooks the real danger of a fascist threat in America, which was an important factor in the thinking of these voters. They spoke out in the elections against Landon, the man whom Hartmann's candidate, Thomas, sought by insidious means to have elected. The bankruptcy of the sectarian Socialist Party policy in this campaign is translated into the

* The S.P.S.S.I. has lived up to its original program in some measure, but not completely. Its council has issued sound public statements on several questions, notably one stating that the evidence of modern scientific psychology is opposed to any hypothesis of mental differences between races. (See the *Daily Worker,* January 4, 1939.) However, there has been an evident tendency in the leadership of the Society to avoid the possible embarrassment connected with taking positions, and to stress the "research" function, as a possible source of guidance at some undetermined future date. The results of a membership referendum on this problem have not yet been published.

** *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* pp. 86-99, Vol. 33, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bankruptcy of Hartmann as a psychologist.*

In general, it is not possible to study propaganda techniques without proper understanding of the issues for which the techniques are employed. Probably much of the obvious superiority of the "practical politician" over the psychologist in this field has its basis in the fact that for the politicians, the inescapable connectedness of technique and objective is clear.

(To be continued.)

* We refer the interested reader to a review by M. H., in the *Psychologists' League Journal* for January-February, 1937, for criticism of Hartmann's study, during the 1935 campaign, of the relative merit of "emotional" and "rational" appeals. It is pointed out that the "emotional" leaflet, which had somewhat greater success, was at least as rational in content as the other.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

BY FRANCIS FRANKLIN

A COMMON culture is one of the characteristics listed by Stalin in his definition of a nation, the other characteristics being a common economic life, a common territory, a common language, and a common historical tradition. The fight for the self-determination of any oppressed nation must be waged against hindrances to free expression in any one of these five fields. In other words, any oppressed nation must fight for the ownership of the land upon which it dwells, for unhampered economic development to raise the standard of living of all its people, for full democratic liberties, for the right to study and use its language in case this is denied (there have been many instances where even this right has been withheld), for the right to study its own history and culture, and to win the opportunity of the fullest development of its cultural inheritance.

The fight for the liberation of any oppressed people must, therefore, be waged on *all* of these five fronts. It is not a fight for "cultural autonomy" alone, as formerly alleged by certain Social-Democrats. Basically, it is a struggle for land and for democracy. But accompanying the effort to secure land and democracy is the struggle for cultural development.

The oppression of the Negro people in the United States expresses itself in one of its phases in the distortion of Negro history. In order to enslave a nation, the exploiting classes of the oppressor nation must both stir up strife between the peoples of the two nations and also keep each in ignorance of the true conditions of the other. The American exploiters, by means of economic discrimination against Negroes, have always sought to align Negro and white toilers against one another. At the same time, the policy of Jim Crowism maintains ignorance between Negro and white. Jim Crowism expresses itself culturally in the fact that in the educational system Negro history is ignored. Even the Negroes are kept in ignorance of their own great history.

Efforts are made, however, to build calumnies upon the basis of this widespread ignorance. Thus, the Negroes who were first brought to America are alleged by white ruling class apologists to have been without exception "howling savages." The entire period of Negro life in Africa is presented as one maze of savagery.

In order to carry on the struggle for the national liberation of the Negro people, it is necessary also to wage ideological struggles, to conduct a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

polemic against all bourgeois distortions of Negro history. The Negro people need to be strengthened by knowledge of their own history. This will help to produce among the Negro people *pride in themselves as a people.* Knowledge of the Negroes and of their achievements will also produce among the white people *respect for the Negro people as a whole.* This respect will help to eradicate all white chauvinism. In order to refute the base slanders of the imperialists against the Negroes as a race, it is necessary to be armed with knowledge of their centuries-old achievements.

EARLY NEGRO CULTURE IN AFRICA

The history of the Negroes in Africa is *not* a blank, not a mere maze of jungle superstition and cannibalism. In fact, Negroes were in touch with highly developed civilization when the ancestors of the proud Anglo-Saxon imperialists were themselves howling savages. Ethiopia, which is today being dominated by the Italian fascist destroyers of culture, is itself a living example of ancient Negro culture. Ethiopia was in touch with the great Egyptian civilization of antiquity, itself partly Negroid, and is mentioned throughout the chronicles of the antique world. Great numbers of Negroes participated in the building of Egyptian civilization. In the bas-reliefs and various pictorial representations found in the pyramids and other architectural remains, many Negroes are depicted. The representations of even some of the Pharaohs reveal distinctly Negroid features. The knowledge of how to smelt iron, the basis of all subsequent civilization, was first discovered by Negroes in the Sudan, from which region it was introduced into the Northern countries.

Too often accounts of early tribes are gravely unfair in that they emphasize almost to the exclusion of all else the superstitions of these peoples. Instead of making an effort to understand superstitions, as science demands, bourgeois writers tend to hold them up as mere objects of horror, overlooking completely the genuine achievements of primitive tribesmen. These achievements were basically technological. And even in primitive societies, the technique of production frequently necessitated relatively complex forms of social organization. The primary function of life is to keep alive, *i.e.,* is economic. In order to wrest a living from nature, mere dreaming is not sufficient. There must be actual knowledge. The technique of production and the invention of tools and implements can take place only upon the basis of correct observation and experimentation, the formation of hypotheses, rigid deductive reasoning, and verification through practice. The control over nature which such technical progress makes possible indicates that there exists some accurate knowledge of nature. This knowledge does not exist in the form of myths, but is proved by practice. This method of acquiring knowledge is essentially the method of science. Thus, even the most backward tribe is not totally deprived of science. In its method of producing the necessities of life, there exists a scientific nucleus, limited though this may be.

The discovery of iron by the Negroes of the Sudan indicates the extent of technical and scientific achievement by those people. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that such achievements were not carried further is to be explained partially by absence in the general climatic and geographical conditions of Africa of factors which would stimulate the development of higher productive forces. At the same time, it must be pointed out that, owing to a limited development of the means of production, the ancestors of the Europeans, even though dwelling in a more favorable climate, lived in a state of savagery and barbarism for thousands of years after highly developed civilizations had developed in China, India, Babylonia, Egypt, Persia, and after the emergence of Negro kingdoms in Africa.

Not only did the Negroes participate in the building of Egyptian civilization, but the influence of that civilization spread through the Negro tribes of the Sudan. Ethiopia, whose emperors claim to trace their lineage from Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, was not the only Negro kingdom which arose in that region. There arose the Empire of Ghana; the kingdoms of Diaro and Soso; and Songhoy, Mandingo and Mossi empires; the Bambara kingdoms; and the Empire of Borna. Historical and descriptive accounts of these kingdoms, which possessed cities and magnificent courts, renowned emperors, great warriors, who led mighty armies in battle, may be read in such authoritative works as G. W. Ellis' *Negro Culture in West Africa* and Maurice Delafosse's *Negroes of Africa.*

Christianity entered the Sudan at an early date, evidently through the early ascetics who fled from "the world" into the Egyptian deserts. Today, the oldest Christian Church in existence is the Coptic Church of Ethiopia. Within its ritual can be found earlier forms of many of the rites of the Catholic Church.

Subsequently, the Sudanese Negroes came in touch with another developed civilization, that of the Mohammedans, which arose about 500 A. D. Many Negro tribes and kingdoms adopted the Moslem religion. At the time when the Moors conquered Spain, many Negroes accompanied them. In fact, the Moors themselves were partly Negro, and today the Spaniards possess a certain percentage of Negro blood. Negroes partook in the Moorish culture in Spain. Many of them attended Spanish universities, became scholars and poets, and carried the culture acquired there back into Africa.

In all the tribes and kingdoms of the Sudan, art flourished. This art was not the product merely of an inherent, natural gift, but a product of the social organization of the people. Its development was the product of struggle first of all against nature, later in America of struggle against oppression. The musical genius of the Negro is well known. If native African music was not highly developed melodically, no music has ever surpassed it in intricacy of rhythm. Native dances flourished along with this rhythmical music. Negro music and dancing both entered Spain, and profoundly influenced the development of the Spanish dance and Spanish music. Many of the fundamental rhythms of Bizet's opera *Carmen* are said to be Negro in origin.

At the same time, the Negroes expressed their genius in plastic art, especially in wood carving. The fig-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ures of Negro sculpture are not idealized natural forms such as those of the Greeks. Instead, Negro sculpture uses natural forms as plastic materials to be reshaped into new forms. As such, they attain a unique beauty in their presentation of forms. They must be appreciated on their own ground. When so approached, they impress one profoundly as virile and living presentations of what might be called the music of form. They have profoundly influenced modern painting and modern sculpture in Europe and America. For excellent photographs of many beautiful examples of Negro sculpture, one may go to Guillaume and Munro's *Primitive Negro Sculpture*.

There has also flourished among the African Negroes a vigorous folklore constisting of many proverbs, wise sayings and fables. These were taken up by Arabian travelers, who spread them into India, Greece and other lands. Influences of these tales are found in Arabian folklore and to a marked extent in the Indian fables contained in the *Hitopadesa*. Aesop's Fables are thought to be derived from Negro folklore. These fables and tales were taken by the slaves to America and were embodied in our literature in the stories of Uncle Remus.

Much trade took place among the various Negro tribes and kingdoms. Trade brought them in contact with Arab and Moorish merchants and with Moslem civilization. Wealthy trading centers sprang up in the Sudan, the most famed being Timbuctoo. Here, there were wealthy Negro merchants and numerous handicraft shops where many objects of exquisite beauty were created. A famous Negro university sprang up here. Timbuctoo became the center of Negro culture.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEGRO CULTURE IN AMERICA

What was the character of the Negro slaves imported to the New World? The tribes on the coast were bribed by the merchants to make raids in the interior of Africa to capture prisoners. There were Mohammedan Negroes who could read the Koran among these early slaves. However, the slave traders and landlords deliberately sought to destroy all remnants of African culture by separating members of the same tribe who spoke the same language as a conscious measure for preventing slaves from communicating with one another and thus from uniting for rebellion. Thus, the Negroes were forced to discontinue the use of their African language and to learn English which became a "common language" for them in America. In this process the Negroes were forced to forget the greater part of their African cultural heritage. Vicious measures were taken to hold the Negro in illiteracy. Negroes today still tell gruesome stories of how their grandparents were held in illiteracy during slave days. On certain plantations, if a Negro was found with a pencil in his hand, the master would, for the first offense, pound his thumb with a hammer; for the second, he would cut off his index finger; for the third, he would cut off his hand. If caught looking into a book, the Negro would be forced to kneel before his master, who would spit tobacco juice in the slave's eyes.

By such brutal measures, a great part of the old African cultures was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uprooted. Negroes from many tribes and kingdoms were united by a common system of oppression. They were fused into a new people with a common language and common culture.

The Negro slaves owned nothing, not even themselves. They suffered unspeakable anguish. By means of numerous glorious insurrections, such as those of Gabriel, Nat Turner, Denmark Vesey and Madison Washington, they sought freedom. But all revolts were crushed, until advancing capitalism, by its onslaught against the slaveholders, gave them allies in their struggles among the white population.

For a time, the partners in the slave traffic justified slavery by stating that the Negro had no soul. Afterwards, they justified it by claiming that through slavery they were saving his soul. They taught the slaves Christianity. In doing so, they forgot that Christianity had arisen among the oppressed masses of the Roman Empire after their revolts had been crushed, and had only subsequently been converted into a ruling class religion. The Negroes revived the primitive aspects of Christianity as a religion voicing the aspirations of the slaves and oppressed classes generally. The masters, on the contrary, sought to use Christianity as an "opium." They sought to divert the minds of the slaves from thoughts of happiness on earth to dreams of "otherworld" bliss.

These dreams and the ability to sing were the only things in which the slaves found compensation for the miseries of their actual lives. From Africa, they had brought their sense of rhythm. In America, they came in contact with English melodies. They learned how to unite melody with their own native rhythms, and in songs which are among the most sublime of any folk music, they expressed the new conditions of their lives. In their "sorrow songs"—spiritual and work songs—they voiced their suffering and their sense of wrong, they expressed their belief in the wickedness of oppressors and the righteousness of those who toil. They also voiced their dreams of heaven.

But even within these dreams, there was expressed the sense of wrong which could so easily spring into rebellion. In fact, religion frequently became a disguise for plots for insurrection, and the masters, from fear of this, frequently forbade them to hold religious services. At times, songs became signals for conspiratorial activities. Thus, the spiritual, "Steal Away to Jesus," was sung right under the eyes of the unsuspecting "bosses" as a signal for the Negroes to "steal away" at midnight to an island on Roanoke River for meetings. In this manner, Negro culture in America was developed as a form of struggle. It was the struggle for freedom which gave to Negro culture its greatest impetus.

The greatest music produced in America has been Negro folk music. This music, Negro dancing, and folklore, expressive Negro figures of speech, etc., have profoundly influenced American culture, to such an extent that, as one Negro writer has said, the American Negroes are an example of a people who, though economically, politically and socially oppressed, are yet to a certain extent culturally dominant. In spite of this fact, the arts and the theatre have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continued to portray an utterly distorted conception of the Negro people as a degraded people.

In the Abolition movement and during Reconstruction days, Negro orators and statesmen of the outstanding character of Frederick Douglass were beginning to come forward. But for a time, after the suppression of the democratic revolutionary movement of the Negro people, leading Negro intellectuals tended to follow the submissive features of Booker T. Washington's policy, which, in other respects, made contributions to the cultural enhancement of the Negro people.

A spirit of disillusionment over their betrayal expressed itself among the Negro people after Reconstruction in the famous "blues" songs. This attitude is voiced clearly in the words, "I'm goin' where they don't shovel snow no more"; "Got de blues, but I'm too damn mean to cry"; the song of the Negro soldiers in the World War, "I've got a grave-diggin' feelin' in my heart," as in practically all of these poignant melodies. The "blues" songs were a notable artistic creation of the Negro people during the period following Reconstruction. They have profoundly influenced all American culture. Many of them have become popular among all the people. They have formed a pattern for many other popular tunes which are today known as typically American.

RECENT ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEGRO CULTURE

In recent years, the Negro people have begun to shake off the Booker T. Washington school of thought. Negro artists and intellectuals are continuing their great tradition of cultural achievement in the realms of poetry, drama, fiction, the plastic arts, and in the movement for liberation. Among the greatest artistic figures of our epoch may be counted Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, Marian Anderson, Roland Hayes, Richard Wright and Rose McClendon, to cite but some. The works of the outstanding Negro intellectuals of our day manifest a new spirit of confidence, pride and unwillingness to continue to submit to the indignities imposed by national oppression.

The work of the Communist Party in challenging the whole system of sharecropping and Jim Crow oppression has been of outstanding significance in helping to develop this new culture of national liberation among the Negro people. In voicing most clearly the aspiration of the Negro people for complete social, political and economic equality, in giving a scientific, theoretical basis to this aspiration, in giving a lucid interpretation of the national character of the Negro liberation movement, and in giving that movement the perspective of realizing the full right of self-determination, the Communist Party has brought a new clarity into the long-continuing struggle of the Negro people for liberty. It has dramatized the plight of the Negro people in the world-famous cases of Scottsboro, Herndon and in its pioneer work among the sharecroppers of the Black Belt. This clarity is profoundly influencing Negro art, as indicated in the development of the younger Negro writers, the Negro drama, etc.

As the democratic front movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advances among the Negroes, organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League are showing a more determined opposition to the old status of oppression. More and more, all Negro organizations are joining forces through the National Negro Congress and the Southern Negro Youth Conference for the great cause of their liberation. One of the outstanding demands of these organizations is for the inclusion of the real history of the Negro people in all American schools. Knowledge of this history will aid the further development of Negro culture and of American culture as a whole. The recent growth and development of the Southern Negro Youth Conference is especially outstanding. It is undertaking the fight for the right to vote, for full citizenship, and for equal educational opportunities right in the heart of the South. At the same time, through launching and supporting forums, discussion groups, People's Theaters, and other forms of educational activity on the burning needs of the Negro people and of the whole South in Negro churches, schools and other organization, it is launching a cultural movement of profound significance among the Negro people of the South.

Of equal importance with these developments among the Negro people themselves is the growing recognition among the white people of Negro cultural achievements and aspirations. This was expressed most dramatically in the recent outpouring in Washington to hear the great Negro singer, Marian Anderson, after she had been denied the use of a hall by the Daughters of American Revolution, and by the large white audience which attended her concert in Birmingham, Alabama.

The growing recognition by white Americans of the contributions of the Negro people has also been indicated by the cooperation of Negro and white in the momentous Southern Human Welfare Conference, held in Birmingham last November; also by the inclusion on Presidential committees in recent years of such outstanding Negro scholars as Dr. Charles S. Johnson.

The greatest of all achievements in furthering the cause of the unity of Negro and white toilers has been the excellent position toward Negro labor adopted by the C.I.O. Within the last few years, it has taken considerable strides toward uniting Negro and white workers in the same locals, thus beginning to break the stranglehold of segregation, which in the past has been foisted upon the labor movement by the reactionary bureaucrats within the A. F. of L. At its last convention, every genuine progressive in America hailed the resolutions there adopted which called for full equality for Negro toilers and which called for an intensive organizational drive in the South. The carrying into life of these resolutions will do more toward securing that unity of the Southern people, so necessary for the development of Negro culture and of Southern culture as a whole, than any event since the end of Reconstruction.

The work of the Associates in Negro Folk Education in popularizing Negro history and culture through their Bronze Booklets is to be wel-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comed and should be widely supported. Such a magazine as *New Challenge* can play an important role in spreading knowledge of the Negro's cultural heritage. Similar commendable work has been undertaken by the theater in various places, for example by the Negro W.P.A. theaters, and by such bodies as the Negro People's Arts Committee of Harlem. Of especial significance is the Negro People's Theater of Richmond, Va. The launching of such theaters in the South can be of enormous importance in rallying the Negro people and in breaking down the "Stepin Fetchit" characterization of the Negro, thus giving the white people a new understanding of Negro life.

The cultural achievements of the Negroes both in Africa and in America must be popularized everywhere. These achievements refute the lies of imperialist chauvinism. They show that the Negro has influenced great and ancient civilizations, that there have existed and still exist highly developed social systems among Negroes, that the Negro has produced art of inestimable worth. Nearly all memory of African culture was crushed by slavery. In this way, slavery brought "civilization" to the Negro, as the slaveholders boasted! Nevertheless, out of their suffering, while held in complete bondage and in a state of the greatest ignorance and illiteracy, the Negro people still proved themselves capable of cultural creation of high value.

If such have been the achievements of Negroes in primitive and unfavorable conditions, as in Africa, and while suffering under the most cruel oppression, as in America, what might not their achievements be under conditions of freedom in the present epoch of advanced technology? Some glimmering of such potential achievements may be obtained from the great cultural development of the formerly oppressed peoples liberated by the great Russian Revolution of October, 1917.

The Negro people are increasingly becoming aware of the fact that in the Soviet Union racial and national oppression have ceased to exist. There, all races and nationalities find genuine equality. More and more, Negroes are learning that socialism grants the freest development to national cultures.

The imperialist bourgeoisie have proved themselves the greatest enemies of culture. Not only do they ruthlessly destroy colonial cultural traditions, seeking to substitute their own shoddy commercialism and culture of the prison, but they seek to throttle all free cultural development in the present. This imprisonment of the human spirit affects not only all those who are thereby brutalized, but also all lovers of culture.

Jim Crowism is hostile to cultural development. Jim Crowism does not merely affect the Negro people; it works both ways. Jim Crowism not merely separates Negro from white, but also white from Negro. The result is cultural impoverishment of white toilers and intellectuals as well as of the Negro people. The latter are capable of giving the whites as much as the whites are capable of giving them. The Negro people form an integral part of America. Their cultural tradition is an American heritage. The American people have a right to this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural heritage. Jim Crowism denies them the inalienable right to come in intimate contact with Negroes and to know their history and their culture. Only by drinking at the fountain of many cultures can mankind attain the highest development. There is nothing so sterile as an intellectual caste system. Negro segregation deprives the majority of white toilers of the opportunity of establishing friendships with the Negro people and of absorbing Negro culture, which is their *inalienable right.* Every toiler and intellectual must cry "Down with the stifling of culture! Long live the cultural development of all peoples!"

All lovers of culture must today join forces with the National Negro Congress and the Southern Negro Youth Conference and other groups which are demanding an end to slanders against the Negro people in the factories, in the professions, in literature, on stage and screen, over the radio, or wherever they may be found; which are demanding channels through which the Negro people may more easily obtain cultural opportunities and give expression to their own creativeness, *viz.,* equal educational opportunity, the inclusion of Negro history in all school curricula, federal support of Negro people's theaters, the right of Negroes to participate in all cultural pursuits.

These cultural demands will be fully realized as the basic demands for land and for democracy are realized. Ownership of the land on which they toil and full democracy will in the end give the Negro people the material and political basis for full cultural development. Therefore, everyone who stands for the most complete development of Negro culture must at the same time seek to prepare the way for the full realization of the right of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt. The immediate tasks in working toward these great objectives are to throw the full weight of popular support into the endeavor to put an end to lynching, to do away with Jim-Crowism and particularly to win the right to vote for every Negro and poor white person in the Southern states. Full citizenship rights are necessary to secure such farm tenancy legislation as will begin to convert the millions of farm tenants in the Black Belt into farm owners. Struggles for such legislative guarantees of economic security are the necessary accompaniments of the effort to develop the culture of the Negro people in our country to the highest possible extent—and thereby to develop the national culture of the entire American people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY AND THE SCIENCES

THE MARXIST PHILOSOPHY AND THE SCIENCES, by J. B. S. Haldane, Random House, New York, 214 pages. $2.00.

As would be expected, editions of scientific books are far larger in the Soviet Union than in any other country. Englishmen such as Eddington, Russell and Hogben have done wonders in popularizing physical science, and Einstein, Infeld and Shapley in this country are not far behind. Yet their readers are comparatively few. No capitalist country has begun to overtake or to surpass the Soviet Union in this respect, or even to realize the need of it. The explanation is obvious. The great untrammeled expansion of Soviet industry and education requires new scientists to the tens of thousands, while Marxist philosophy extends a consuming interest in technological matters to the population at large. Socialism and its philosophy first lay down the foundation for a real democracy of scientific learning.

In leading capitalist countries, however, there is now a new trend in scientific writing which is full of promise. Bernal, Levy and Haldane in England, the *A la Lumiere du Marxisme* group in France and the scientists in the circle of *Science and Society* in the United States are committed to the idea that science and its promulgation must keep pace with the unfolding of historical openings and necessities. Leroy's disparagement of scientific truth in favor of religious dogma and Eddington's return to the Quakerism of his youth appear to them as a kind of retreat before the enemy—not unlike the surrender at Munich. These scientists, who are for the most part academicians, either accept the full Marxist position or are fast approaching it.

The present book by Professor Haldane is the latest product of this progressive movement. In some respects it is the most valuable achievement so far. Certainly, no such comprehensive Marxist review of modern developments in the sciences has yet appeared in English. Beginning with a brief chapter which formulates important Marxist principles, Professor Haldane proceeds in the rest of the book to demonstrate that recent achievements in mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology and sociology exemplify and embody these principles. The statement of the principles, the unity of theory and practice, materialism, and dialectical materialism with its three laws, follows the account of Engels very closely and should prove especially helpful to scientists and to all who are making their first approach to Marxism.

The illustrations offered, most of them derived from contemporary science, are original and most rewarding. For example, Haldane shows that physics, which is usually regarded as aloof from history, has been transformed in the past few years by the "expanding universe" theories of Milne and Dirac. Whatever the final verdict on their work may be, it will be found, the author says:

> ". . . that they have introduced the historical process into exact physics, even although for all ordinary purposes these historical changes will be negligible."

Engels' ideas were further confirmed by the discovery that the lines on the spectra of various stars, which seemed to point to a different chemical composition, really prove that these stars are at different stages of stellar evolution.

The Quantum Theory and the "uncertainty principle" furnish another example. While noted physicists with a penchant for theology have chosen to infer free will, God and skepticism of science, Haldane makes the neat retort that "quantum mechanics raise more difficulties for theism than they can solve," and adds that:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The same fact which gives us the uncertainty principle in connection with the motion of individual particles gives us an immense amount of verifiable deductions concerning properties of matter which add to our knowledge to such an extent that we might legitimately speak of a new certainty principle."

He depicts the Quantum Theory as a unity of necessity and accident and recalls Engels' remark: "One knows that what is maintained to be necessary is composed of sheer accidents and that the so-called accidental is the form behind which necessity hides itself."

The chapter on biology, which is easily the best in the book, offers many exemplifications of dialectical principles. A discussion of the dialectical opposition between mutation and selection is especially instructive. Here the analysis is more complex and varied than in the other chapters and there is less tendency to apply an abstract dialectical formula to a concrete case insufficiently elaborated. The chapters on psychology and sociology, on the other hand, while brilliant and informative, like the rest of the book, have less to offer in illustrative material. The real resources of these subjects are left untapped. For the most part, only peripheral matters are discussed.

Thus, the brief space allowed to psychology is given over too much to philosophy and physiology, while the chapter on sociology follows the line of the author's interests (dwelling, for example, upon the history of the domestication of animals), rather than the direction of present sociological research. Illustrations of Marxian dialectic are not lacking in these chapters, but they are less original, and more familiar to students of Marxism than those in earlier parts of the book. They are none the less important for the scientists and the broad public to which the book is addressed.

Haldane shows the bearing of dialectic upon science by a wide gamut of examples, ranging from the skidding of an automobile to the development of genetics and the relativity theory. He also attempts to delimit its application:

"Most scientific work," he says, "is done in a limited field. It no more needs dialectic than it needs differential calculus or a microscope. Nevertheless, I am convinced that Marxism proves the greatest value in studying the development of science, and the relationship of the different sciences to one another, particularly the relation of chemistry to physics, and of biology to chemistry. And it is particularly useful in those branches of sciences which are themselves concerned with change, for example, in the theory of evolution."

Unfortunately, this line of thought is not carried further. Although superficial, mechanical, applications of dialectic are cited, no great effort is made to demarcate the false from the genuine instances, nor to indicate the unity of dialectic with the special technics of science. This brings us to the main drawback of the book. It is too short. Had it been longer many interesting ideas thrown out could have been elaborated. The sometimes schematic application of dialectical principles would have given place to longer, more circumstantial accounts of scientific developments, in the course of which these principles would have emerged as internal and integral factors, as the constant and inevitable accomplices of the whole process. Haldane is aware of the danger:

"In what follows," he says, "I propose to give a sketch of the dialectic so brief and abstract as to be almost a caricature. . . . Such a presentation lays itself open to a severe criticism. The dialectic, which is a unity, appears as a collection of rules of thumb, one or other of which should be applied whenever possible."

If such a distorted view of dialectic is encouraged by his book, he says, it will be dispelled by the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Haldane anticipates our criticism. The *Preface* explains why the book is not longer. It is based upon a series of lectures given before scientific students at the University of Birmingham, and its purpose is to demonstrate the importance of dialectic to a whole series of sciences in very short space. Naturally the book fell into two parts, a brief statement of the dialectical principles and a rapid search for exemplifications. But this procedure, with all its dangers of mechanical applications, was perhaps necessitated by the circumstances.

The brevity and haste of the book may also be responsible for certain mistakes or faulty formulations. When Haldane states, for example, that besides Marxism, there are two other important philosophies which issue in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action, that is, scholasticism and science, he appears to set up a sharp contrast between science and dialectical materialism. But it is clear from the rest of the book that this is not what he means. He holds, with Marxism, that dialectic theory is simply more articulate and scientific than any opponent theory, not that it is in any way an alternative to science. Sometimes, too, he oversimplifies dialectic.

"With regard to the dialectic development," he says in one place, "it can be summed up fairly simply. You discover a rule in mathematics. You next proceed to break the rule, and you then modify your original definitions in such a way as to make the breach legitimate."

This is as simple as falling off a log. It is much too simple. If dialectical development were nothing but this, it would be only a biographical or subjective process, having no necessary relevance to the objective universe. Even so it would not do justice to the complexity of the dialectic process in the history of science, as Haldane, of course, is fully aware.

Haldane's formulations sometimes suggest more serious misconceptions. In one place, for example, he states that Marxian philosophy "is by its very nature a method rather than a doctrine." This is an unfortunate blunder, in no way borne out by the rest of the book, but it is dangerous all the same. The view that Marxism is nothing but a method, an instrument or technic, and that its value is independent of its objective validity, seems to hark back to the philosophers of pragmatism and instrumentalism. Expressions which suggest such an instrumentalist interpretation of Marxism should be carefully corrected. Marxism, of course, is not a fixed doctrine, but neither is it a mere method nor even principally a method. It is a unity of scientific acquisitions and the method based upon them. It is a dialectical approach to the full objective truth, as Engels said. Haldane, except for the mistake pointed out, accepts this fully.

But these criticisms do not touch the core of Haldane's brilliant and sound book, which, despite its brevity, discusses dialectical developments in many fields of science. The main objection is to the sometimes mechanical fashion with which he applies abstract principles to scientific examples; but, as we have seen, the plan of the book made this difficult to avoid. It is not what Haldane says that is objectionable, but that he does not say enough. The remedy is obvious. Let us hope that Haldane will soon write a more thorough book, or one which covers one field of science more intensively.

PHILIP CARTER

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATEST BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND PERIODICALS RECEIVED

THE 1940 ELECTIONS: HOW THE PEOPLE CAN WIN, *by Earl Browder.* Workers Library Publishers, New York. 5c.

CAN CONSCRIPTION SAVE PEACE? *by Harry Pollitt.* Communist Party of Great Britain, London. 1d.

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO PEOPLE—1619-1918. *Based on a series of lectures delivered by Elizabeth Lawson, Chairman, History Department, Workers School,* Workers Bookshop, New York. 40c.

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS . . ." *Statements on anti-Semitism by 54 leading American writers, statesmen, educators, clergymen and trade unionists.* The League of American Writers, New York. 25c.

HOW TO WIN JOBS AND SECURITY IN THE ANTHRACITE, *by Joseph Stensky.* Communist Party of the Anthracite, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

YOUTH ARSENAL OF FACTS. Prepared by Labor Research Association, New York. 25c.

HOW THE EIGHTH ROUTE ARMY FIGHTS IN NORTH CHINA. New China Information Committee, Hongkong. 20c.

"FROM THESE HONORED DEAD . . ." *by David McKelvy White and James Hawthorne.* Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion, New York. 3c.

BRITONS IN SPAIN, the History of the British Battalion of the XVth International Brigade, *by William Rust.* International Publishers, New York, 1939. $1.00.

THE MINIMUM WAGE: AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY. International Labor Office, Geneva, 1939. $1.25.

SUR LA SITUACION DES PRISONNIERS EN ESPAGNE FRANQUISTE. Comite de Secours aux Prisonniers de la Guerre d'Espagne, 113 Rue du Faubourg Poissonniere, Paris (IX), France.

OESTERREICH UNTER DEM REICHSKOMMISSAR. Editions Nouvelles d'Autriche, 55 Rue de Rivoli, Paris (IV), France.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE U.S.S.R., *Edited by Prof. A. V. Shestakov.* Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U.S.S.R., Moscow. Price $1.00.

RUSSIA UP-TO-DATE, *by L. A. Coblentz.* Red Lake Falls, Minnesota. Price 15c.

EQUALITY, Vol. I, No. 1, May, 1939. A monthly journal to defend democratic rights and combat anti-Semitism and racism. Equality, New York. 15c.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A BOOK OF WORLD IMPORTANCE!

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Prepared under the supervision of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U.

"The study of the heroic history of the Bolshevik Party arms us with the knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle, with the knowledge of the driving forces of the revolution.

"The study of the history of the C.P.S.U. strengthens our confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of Communism throughout the entire world."

From Introduction to **History of the C.P.S.U.**

"WITH THIS BOOK WE WILL RAISE UP A WHOLE GENERATION SCHOOLED IN THE BEST THOUGHT PRODUCED BY HUMANITY."

Earl Browder, **Theory as a Guide to Action**

364 Pages. Cloth $1.00

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PAMPHLETS
ON
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The 1940 Elections: How the People Can Win
By Earl Browder 05

From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union
By Joseph Stalin 05

The Economics of Communism: The Soviet Union in Its World Relations
By Earl Browder 05

Religion and Communism
By Earl Browder 02

Anti-Semitism, the Struggle for Democracy, and the Negro People
By James W. Ford 03

The $60 at 60 Pension Plan: Minimum Security for Our Senior Citizens 05

Are We Aryans?
By Gino Bardi 05

Ready Soon

Your Questions Answered
By William Z. Foster 15

How the Rich Live
By Nan and Ernest Pendrell 05

The Real Father Coughlin
By A. B. Magil 05

The 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. (Bolsheviks)

D. Z. MANUILSKY, on the World Communist Movement . . .10

V. M. MOLOTOV, on the Third Five-Year Plan of the U.S.S.R. . .15

A. A. ZHDANOV, on Party Building in the Soviet Union . . .15

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books

Ready

The German Ideology

By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

One of the classics of Marxist theory $2.00

●

New Data for Lenin's "Imperialism"

Edited by E. Varga and L. Mendelsohn $1.60

Complete text of Lenin's "Imperialism" with supplementary material.

●

Easter Week

By Brian O'Neill

A significant chapter in Irish revolutionary history. 25c

●

Youth Arsenal of Facts

By Labor Research Association

New pocket handbook for ready reference 25c

Communism, Science and Culture

By Jacques Duclos

An address to professionals and intellectuals 15c

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED